THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

o. 2 JUNE Vol. XLIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

onsecration of the Queen and Dedication of he Commonwealth

The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II has surpassed in lendour all its predecessors; but it is not its regal splendour but s spiritual and moral significance that we need to realize.

It is not the Queen's Coronation but her Consecration and th her Consecration the Dedication of her subjects which is the ost profound and precious reality symbolized in this historic lebration.

The nature of this reality is felicitously expressed in the rds of Elizabeth herself in her South African Broadcast on r Twenty-first Birthday:

> *'If we all go forward together with unwavering faith, high courage and a quiet heart we shall be able to make of this ancient Commonwealth an even grander thing—more free, more prosperous, more happy and a more powerful influence for good in the world than it has been in the greatest days of our forefathers.'*

rofessor Norman Sykes has emphasized in the *Spectator* of ay 15 the authority which our Coronation Service derives from s antiquity:

> 'The actual Order of Coronation itself may be traced in continuous historical succession to the sacring of King Edgar by St. Dunstan in 973: and during the millennium of its formal evolution it has embraced Byzantine, Germanic and French elements from other coronation rites.'

hn Todd, in his article entitled 'Is our King a Layman?' blished in the *Modern Churchman* of January-March, 1944 ol. xxxiii), stresses that our English constitution is not Erastian some continental ecclesiastics are inclined to assert, but is sentially Regal. Our sovereign is a sacred person—the efender of the Faith, and is, over all causes, ecclesiastical as ell as civil within the realm supreme. This sacred character of

the Sovereign is symbolized by the Anointing in the coronation ceremonial. This anointing is indeed the essential ceremony. John Todd writes in the article cited:

> 'Whilst there is no example of an English coronation service without anointing, there are examples of English coronation services without a crown.'

Shakespeare affirms the indelible nature of this anointing in the words of Richard II.

> 'Not all the waters in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm from an anointed king.'

The government of the Church of England is not Erastian but Regal. We cite John Todd's conclusion:

> 'Erastianism is the government of the Church by the State, but Regalism, as defined by the *Oxford Dictionary*, is the government of the Church by the king. The king is not consecrated to any priestly function nor to any ministering of the Word and Sacraments, but he is consecrated to the task of government, to rule both Church and State. And as his rule is over the Church as well as over the State, it is right and proper that he should be of the clergy as well as of the laity. That he should be of the clergy is contrary to the Canon Law as developed under Hildebrandine influence, but not contrary to pre-Hildebrandine Church practice and belief. Regalism is the law of England, and in any case in which the Canon Law comes into conflict with the Common Law of this country, the Canon Law is null and void' (p. 332).

Charges of Papalist Persecution

Readers of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* have been sickened and horrified by the atrocity of the persecution of Christians by Christians. In these narratives of persecution the Papacy and its adherents have played a terrible part. The mediaeval apology for these persecutions, that the sufferings endured by the martyrs were as nothing compared with the sufferings inflicted by God on the damned, has become an offence in consequence of the indignant disbelief in the Dogma of Everlasting Torment.

Our British civilization for the last three centuries has known nothing of such religious persecution except possibly in New England in the case of the Quakers and in Ireland in the case of the Romanists.

In less civilized Christian lands, and not least in those where Roman Catholicism is in power, religious persecution has survived; but this survival must be abhorent to many Roman Catholics. Why then does it continue to survive? There are political and social reasons for this, but we have to recognize that the *religious* reason for persecution survives even to-day and that this religious reason is definitely sanctioned by Papal authority.

his papal policy must seem hardly credible to English people ho have Roman Catholic friends and relations. Yet a recent ook, *Terror over Yugoslavia*,[1] by Avro Manhattan, records the palling horrors of such persecution, organized by the Roman atholic Archbishop Stepinac and sanctioned by the Vatican. Its ictims were for the most part members of the Eastern Orthodox hurch living in Yugoslavia.

When European Fascism collapsed, Stepinac was brought to ial and was condemned to sixteen years imprisonment by a court hich consisted of Croatian Roman Catholics. Avro Manhattan rites :

> 'The Vatican uttered a cry of horror, instantly amplified a thousandfold by the Catholic Hierarchies, Catholic agencies, and Catholic Press the world over. Pope Pius XII ordered the excommunication of all those who had taken part in the trial, from Tito himself down to the least official connected in any way with Stepinac's indictment' (p. 113). (See also the *Churchman* (New York, April 15, 1953): Article entitled 'The Case of Stepinac.')

f course we are in no position to disprove Avro Manhattan's legations but we hope that the Vatican can and will do so.

We turn now to another region of the modern world in which oman Catholicism is dominant—Colombia in South America. *eligions*, January-April, 1953,[2] deals with the persecution of rotestants by Roman Catholics in Colombia. The Editor writes :

> 'We gather from a report in a recent issue of the *Observer* that persecutions of Protestants by Catholics in Colombia had led to protests by the World Council of Churches to the Colombian Government. During the past nine months twenty-nine attacks have been made on Protestant congregations and missionaries. A few weeks ago twenty armed men entered the house of Canadian members of the World-wide Evangelisation Crusade; the missionaries were beaten and their home wrecked. According to evidence collected by the World Council of Churches during 1952, there were 150 instances of the violation of the Freedom of Religion Clause in the Colombian Constitution: seven people were killed, three churches destroyed and forty Protestants imprisoned.'

e have failed to find any protest made by the Vatican denoung such persecution.

We know, of course, that religious persecution has been cognized for centuries by the Vatican as the right and duty of

[1] *Terror over Yugoslavia.* The Threat to Europe, by Avro Manhattan A. Watts & Co., 1953; 10/6). See also *Catholic Imperialism and World eedom,* by Avro Manhattan (Watts, 30/-).

[2] *Religions.* The Journal of the Society for the Study of Religions, edited Victor Fisher, 26 Buckland Crescent, N.W.3. Price, 3/6. Annual Subiption, 10/6, post free.

Catholics; but would it not be possible for the Vatican, in view c the modern situation and the perilous position which the Vatica itself is facing, for the Pope to issue a Bull (pious papal platitude promulgated by the B.B.C. are not adequate) positively renoun cing and denouncing religious persecution by Papalists? Th would not only give relief to many modern-minded Roma Catholics, especially those living in Protestant communities, bu it would also strengthen, in the best way, the influence c Christianity in facing a non-Christian world.

Bible Reading in Church Services

It is significant that *The Times* should have treated in a sub leader (May 6) entitled *Lessons in Church*, the need for Revised Lectionary. As a consequence, an informative and sug gestive correspondence ensued in *The Times*. The occasion c the sub-leader was due to a discussion in the Church Assembl and its passing of a resolution for the production of two alterna tive lectionaries either of which might be used. At present ther are four lectionaries available and we venture to suggest that th two new proposed lectionaries should be employed to supple ment, not to replace, those now in use, and that a rubric shoul be added giving the officiating minister *freedom* to select specia lessons when he desires so to do. Liturgical uniformity, whic had its uses when church attendance was compulsory and in conse quence regular, ought to yield to-day in our modern situation t liturgical flexibility comprehensively defined. The fact that ou Church Services are regulated primarily by the sequence of th church seasons with their appointed collects, epistles an Gospels, is sufficient to protect educational order and variatio which should be the basis of our scripture reading in Church.

It is a great help to the educational value of Scripture readin that its Lessons should be prefaced by a brief clear and accurat introduction. A collection of such Introductions[3] was produce in 1933 by the Rev. H. Bernard Tower, sometime Headmaste of Hurstpierpoint with a commendation by Dr. Bell, Bishop o Chichester.

Our Church authorities would do well to authorize and enlarg this valuable little handbook in connection with any new lec tionaries that they may produce.

There was one aspect of Anglican lectionary revision whic was not stressed, and very naturally, in *The Times* correspon dence—the inclusion of such large portions of the Old Testamen

[3] *Short Introductions to the Revised Lectionary*, by H. Bernard Tower (Skeffington, 1938.)

our church services. Unless the congregation be educated in wider field of the origin, evolution and comparative history of world's religions, it will fail to appreciate and almost inevitly misjudge the significance of much of the Old Testament riptures. Such Scriptural Lessons can create a prejudice ainst the Christian Religion and lead to the identification in ny cases of a Christian doctrine with Old Testament teaching ich in some cases that doctrine surpasses and in other cases ly contradicts. With the acute and bitter rivalry which exists ween Judaism and Islam in the middle East to-day, the less h Nationalist claims and conflicts are reflected in Christian rship and doctrine, the better for Christian influence in interional policies.

George Adam Smith once said to the writer of this editorial t 'the Treasure and the Mystery of the Religion of Israel is prophetism.' This is profoundly true and the Christian ligion needs to have this prophetism preserved and powerfully nsmitted in our Church services.

To secure the greatest benefit from this urgent lectionary vision we must exhibit not only fine moral, spiritual and rary judgment but also must be prepared to secure a freedom the handling of Jewish Scriptures which will not only offend blical Fundamentalism but also Traditionalist Ecclesiasticism. But has the Church of England the courage and the consiscy to achieve this? How much of what is going on to-day in rica (where the Christian Religion is striving to deliver vast ive populations from pagan magic and barbarous practices) nands a revised Old Testament Lectionary? To-day we hear ch of African Mau Maus. Nearly a century ago we heard ch of New Zealand Hau Haus and some ten thousand British ops were required to suppress them.

What were these Maori Hau Haus? They were apostate ssionary converts. What did they do with their Bibles? They erved for their religious needs, as they understood them, tain portions of 'the fighting books of the Old Testament,' . *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Samuel*, and dispensed with the rest. An esting account of Maori Hau Hauism is sardonically described a former Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery in his Introducn to *Old New Zealand* by a Pakeha Maori:

> 'These Maori gentlemen were very well up in their Old Testaments and extremely practical in the use of the New. They made cartridges of them.' (Macmillan's edition, 1900, p. ix.)

How ought the Christian Church to utilize the Old Testament very old problem. In the first century the Church took over

the whole of the Old Testament bodily, but in the second century an influential effort was made to throw out the Old Testament altogether. Marcion, a Christian layman, a wealthy shipowner, the son of a bishop of Sinope, described by Harnack as 'the most Christian of the gnostics,' maintained that the Old Testament was the sacred book of Jehovah, the inferior God of the Jews; and the New Testament, the sacred book of the supreme Deity, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Marcion's theological dualism proved his undoing and he was saluted by the saintly Polycarp as 'the first-born of Satan.'

What is wrong in the Church of England at the present time is that although scholars have really solved our Scriptural problems the English Church in its Lectionaries has failed to implement their solutions practically.

'They are at it Again'

'They' in our heading to this paragraph refers to our Anglo-Catholic brethren and 'it' refers to Episcopacy as the bone of contention.

In the 'Signs of the Times' of our last issue we dealt with the 'Episcopal Barrier to Intercommunion.' On May 4, the *Oxford Mail* published the following paragraph:

> Canon John Collins, Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral and former Dean of Oriel College, Oxford, has upset the 'High Church' again by inviting Nonconformist ministers to preach in St. Paul's Cathedral in a series of sermons on Church unity.
>
> The *Church Times* has taken the unusual step of refusing to print the names of the preachers in announcements of services at St. Paul's 'because the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral has been opened to persons not having episcopal consecration or ordination.'
>
> The Bishop of London, Dr. Wand is indirectly involved in the dispute for he had approved the invitation to Nonconformist preachers.
>
> Canon Collins yesterday said he would be interested to see whether the *Church Times* bans the announcement of the Coronation service now that the Moderator of the Church of Scotland has been invited to take part.

The first in this series of non-episcopally ordained preachers in St. Paul's was the Rev. Maurice Watts, B.D., a former Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, who was reported fully in the *Church of England Newspaper* of May 8. The preacher kicked off by asserting that the great obstacle to church unity is the Anglican insistence upon the absolute necessity of accepting episcopacy as a necessary condition of reunion. He maintained that:

> 'It is impossible for Free Churchmen to adopt any scheme of union which would sever their relations with their brethren throughout the

world. You [Anglicans] will sympathise with that because you feel exactly the same.

It is possible that this may point to a far purpose of God. It may be in the large purpose of God, that He is planning a union not on a national scale, but on a world scale.

It is true that we have differing ministries, but perhaps there is room in the great Church of God for different ministries.'

The second sermon in the series was delivered by Dr. Hugh artin, Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council. The llowing extracts from his sermon are taken from the *Church England Newspaper*, May 15. Dr. Hugh Martin said:

'I cannot believe that ordination to the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments is what the Church of England has to give to the Free Churches. To accept that position would be a denial of the manifest fact that God has used the Free Churches and their ministers for many years and throughout the world, with no apparent distinction from His use of episcopally ordained ministers . . .

'There is all the difference in the world between mutual authorisation for a wider ministry and any proposal involving in fact or by implication the reordination of those, whether Anglican or Free Church, who are already ministers of the Church of Christ . . .

'That is to say, representative Free Churchmen in the past Conversations, of whom I was one, have certainly agreed that episcopacy would be a necessary and valuable element in a reunited Church. But there have always been three qualifications attached, which have been reasserted in any comments by official Free Church Assemblies:

(1) Episcopacy is to be only one element in Church order.
(2) Episcopacy must be "constitutional and representative."
(3) The theory of "apostolic succession" is not accepted, nor the belief that episcopal ordination is essential for a true ministry of the Word and Sacraments.'

r. Prestige Defends Episcopacy

On May 10, Dr. Prestige, Canon and Treasurer of St. Paul's, eaching before the University of Cambridge, defended the glo-Catholic insistence on the essential value of Episcopacy a sermon entitled *The Gift of Bishopric*.[4] Dr. Prestige's sition is clearly presented in the following citation:

'Episcopacy can be presented as an element essential to the full constitution of the Christian Church without either depreciating other essential elements or claiming for it any higher values than properly belong to it. I believe it holds a key position in the divine pattern of organized Churchmanship.'

But where is this 'divine pattern of organized Chuchmanship' be found? Is it to be found in the Scriptures or must we look

[4] *The Gift of Bishopric*, by G. L. Prestige, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1953; 2/6 .)

for it in the institutional development and organization of the Christian Church as a whole throughout its history? The Papalist and the Plymouth Brother both find their 'divine pattern of organized Churchmanship' in the Scriptures and the Divine pattern as they see it differs widely from the *media via* of the Church of England. But the Judicious Hooker does not claim scriptural authority for our English historic Episcopate. For Hooker, scriptural ideals and practical needs have co-operated in the creation of the Ministry of the *Ecclesia Anglorum* and there has, of course, been a very considerable development and expansion in that sphere since Hooker's time. The road into the future is no *cul de sac*. This being so, the only valid justification for the extension of the Episcopate to the whole Christian Church must be, not as the preliminary to inter-communion but as its consummation. This is the real point at issue and we Modern Churchmen hold that inasmuch as the Holy Communion is the Lord's Table, we are not acting in the spirit of the Lord by excluding any of our fellow-Christians from that Holy Communion on the ground that they are not episcopally governed.

There is one dominating sentiment which we believe characterizes the worthy communicant and that is the sense of unworthiness, and it should characterize the officiating ministry even more profoundly than the non-officiating communicant. If this be true the exclusive use of Holy Communion should be as repellent to the Christian consciousness as the idea of an exclusive episcopate. We are with Dr. Prestige if he will consent to substitute the inclusive episcopate and the inclusive Holy Communion for their exclusive and disciplinary use—an inheritance from Judaism not from Jesus Christ.

Will not Dr. Prestige, a scholar and a historian, and a not illiberal Anglo-Catholic, lead his fellow Anglo-Catholics along this path up the Hill of Difficulty? Should he do so he may find that the lions which he hears roaring ahead are chained by ministerial and sacramental grace.

The Baptists and the Bishops

The Baptists have just published (May, 1953) an important statement on English Church Unity. It is entitled *Church Relations in England* (Catey Kingsgate Press, 1953; 6d.). It constitutes a reply to the Anglican proposals of the Derby Committee published by the S.P.C.K. in 1950.

After stating their objection to formal subscription to Creeds the Baptists proceeded to state their objections to the acceptance

Episcopacy as a necessary condition of intercommunion. They sert according to the *Church Times* of May 8 that

> 'The claims commonly made for episcopacy are, in our judgment, not proven. They cannot be substantiated from the New Testament; nor, as we think, are they borne out by Church history. The episcopate has not preserved either the unity or the continuity of the Church. The continuity of the Church, as it seems to us, is a continuity of life in Christ, brought into being by the proclamation of the Word and by steadfast continuance "in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." It does not depend on the doubtful continuity of a ministerial succession supposed to reach back to the apostles.
>
> Rather than stress exclusively some one form of Church order, we feel bound to put the emphasis on the continuing activity of the Holy Spirit manifested throughout the Body of Christ, on the spiritual life and service shown by Christians in all ages and in all sections of the Church.'

ıe Baptists are here both scripturally and historically on sound ound. Episcopacy has not effectively protected the Christian urch either from heresy or schism. The acceptance of the gma of the Assumption as an essential article of the Christian th by the Roman Church and its multitude of bishops is a monstration that episcopacy is not a secure protection against resy. The claim of the 'ever-memorable' John Hales that not who separates from the Church but he who causes the separan is the schismatic and that therefore the Bishop of Rome is the eatest schismatic in Christendom, justifies the second objection nounced by the Baptists that Bishops are not a protection ainst schism. Hence the Baptist's conclusion: it is therefore defensible that the Church of England should 'bind intermmunion with episcopacy.'

Of course the Church of England is rightly entitled to possess d retain its historic episcopate, and holding the historic episcote to be of the *bene esse* of the Church of England, we liberal urchmen have no desire to abolish it, at any rate so long as ection to it is made by the Crown acting through the Prime inister as the representative of the English laity. Should epispal election, however, be controlled by a clerical party in the urch and not by the laity as a whole, we should be compelled believers in the basic priesthood of the laity to reconsider our tention of episcopacy. Be that as it may, to force, as a preiminary to inter-communion, the acceptance of our historic episcote upon Christian churches who do not believe in it as the best rm of Church government, is surely a grievous offence against ristian love, Christian freedom and Christian truth. We could sh that our Primate would affirm this unflinchingly.

A Quaker on Christian Unity

William E. Wilson, a well-known Quaker leader and lecturer, in his latest book *Essential Christianity*[4] deals optimistically with the advances being made towards Christian unity. He writes of the British Council of Churches:

> 'For more than a quarter of a century there has been an organised movement working for Christian Unity. It does not include the Roman Church, but that is only because the Roman Church will not join it. It includes almost all British, American and Continental Non-Roman Christian bodies, and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, as well as all the new Non-Roman Churches in Asia and Africa, the products of the last century and a half of intensive missionary work. It is therefore world-wide; and its council is formed of some of the most outstanding leaders of the Church taken from every section of it and from all the leading nations.
>
> The gains of this movement are plain and considerable. The rancour and bitterness which fifty years ago frequently characterised on both sides the relations of Dissent and Establishment in England are almost entirely a thing of the past. We are all learning to work together, and what is more important are learning to recognise one another as brothers in Christ. But while relations are immensely improved, unity has not been achieved' (p. 22).

Mr. Wilson holds, as we do, that further progress demands a more radical conception of what constitutes *the essential basis* of Christian Unity. He does not find it in the acceptance of Creeds, Orders of Ministry and Sacraments. He writes:

> 'I would maintain that none of these is the basis, or even part of the basis of unity. Each has historically been the cause of repeated divisions. None is central enough to constitute the basis of unity. All are rather outworks thrown up to defend the central position. Just as the Pharisees of our Lord's day, in order that the commandments of the law should in nowise be disobeyed, built a hedge about it' (p. 22).
>
> 'All that was provided had a useful place. The wrong came when they were mistaken for the Faith itself' (p. 23).

Mr. Wilson makes a most important addition to our knowledge of the membership of the British Council of Churches:

> 'Why have the leaders of this movement towards unity in Great Britain insisted that the Society of Friends should send representatives to their Council? Certainly not because Quakers agree, or are likely to agree, on these points, but because in them is recognised this other something' (p. 24).

'It is a life, a fact, an experience,' inspired by the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

[4] *Essential Christianity* by William E. Wilson (Allen and Unwin, 1952; 12/6).

'Our United Christian Faith is:

To commit our lives to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that He may work in us to will and to do of His good pleasure.'

his being so, we mark with regret a practical omission in . E. Wilson's book. While he speaks with rightful gratification the insistence by the British Council of Churches that the akers should be represented on it, he does not record that e Unitarians are excluded from it. Yet surely the Unitarians n and do whole-heartedly accept the Christian Faith as cited ove:

'Our United Christian Faith is:

To commit our lives to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that He may work in us to will and to do of His good pleasure.'

ODERN CHURCHMEN AND LIBERAL RELIGION

The thirty-sixth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen be held this year at Oxford, September 14-18, has selected eligious Liberalism as its theme. Sir Henry Self has chosen for s Presidential Address 'The Permanent Values of Liberalism.' he Moral Foundations of Liberalism' will be treated by the ev. H. C. Snape: 'The Psychological Basis' will be treated by e Rev. R. S. Lee, Vicar of the University Church, Oxford.

The Dean of St. Paul's will deal with 'Liberal Protestantism,' d the Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon will deal with 'Liberal tholicism.' Dr. E. L. Allen will deal with 'Liberal Non-nformity.' Canon Bezzant (Dean of St. John's College Cam-idge) treats 'The Continuing Task of Liberal Theology.'

Professor Simon of the University of Strasbourg, we are glad note, will deal with the difficult and delicate theme: 'Continen-Theology, Protestant and Catholic.' A no less delicate and fficult subject, 'Liberal Christianity in an Established Church,' ll be treated by Dr. Greer, Bishop of Manchester.

Dr. James Parkes, an authority on contemporary Judaism, will ad a paper on Liberal Judaism. The opening sermon will be livered by the Rev. Howard Root (Cambridge University ecturer in the Philosophy of Religion).

Last but not least Professor Gilbert Murray, O.M., D.Litt., B.A., will conclude with 'The Future of Religion.' If we cept Dr. Gilbert Murray's basic classical meaning of Liberal *it for a free man*,' the more we can learn about Liberal Religion e better for a progressive human civilization as well as for the dividuals who ought to be its agents.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN WILLIAM WALKER

1859—1953

J. W. WALKER, O.B.E., F.R.C.S., F.S.A., to whom we, as Modern Churchmen, owe much, died on February 17, in his ninety-fourth year.

As a member for many years of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, he served our cause with unselfish loyalty. He never missed attendance at our annual conferences and we are all conscious of the debt those conferences owe at the present time to his distinguished daughter, their honorary secretary. Not less devoted were his services as a governor of Ripon Hall.

Educated at Rossall and University College, London, J. W. Walker followed in the footsteps of his father, a distinguished surgeon of Wakefield, Yorkshire, and entered the medical profession. For thirty years as surgeon he served Clayton Hospital where his father had previously held the position of consulting surgeon. In the First World War he served in the Territorial Army with the rank of Captain in the R.A.M.C. and received the O.B.E. in recognition of his services.

Well-known as a very skilful surgeon (recognized in his own profession by his election in 1941 to the high honour of Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons) he was much more widely known as an archaeologist and antiquary. At the time of his death he was the oldest Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. A member of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society for over seventy years; its President for twenty-four years; he devoted himself to the extension of its permanent institutions, particularly its library, and to its educational organization. He founded the Wakefield Historic Society. He carried out excavations at Monk Bretton Priory and Sandal Castle, but his greatest archaeological research is enshrined in his massive volume *Wakefield: Its History and People* published in 1934 but re-published (revised and enlarged) in two volumes in 1939.

A Wakefield man himself, his family having dwelt there since the thirteenth century, there was nothing he did not know about its wonderful collection of antiquities of every kind—ecclesiastical, architectural, legal, civic, social. But his interest in architecture, monuments, painted glass, church furniture, etc., were not purely antiquarian. He possessed highly developed powers of aesthetic appreciation.

When he transferred his residence to Berkshire he and his aughter (M. I. Walker, F.R.Hist. Soc.) produced *Church Plate Berkshire*—a record as comprehensive as it is minutely accurate nd beautifully illustrated. This volume Queen Mary graciously ermitted to be dedicated to her.

An unflinching Liberal Churchman, opposed to superstition nd to doctrinal and liturgical reaction, he had the greatest everence for the Church of England and never hesitated to ndertake services of every kind on her behalf.

During the First World War the curate at Chapelthorpe Wakefield) was anxious 'to join up' but his Bishop objected. hen at a Diocesan meeting Walker pleaded that clergy should e allowed to go, the Bishop threw out the challenge 'If Mr. alker will conduct the services at Chapelthorpe, I will let the urate go.'

Walker accepted the Bishop's challenge and in addition to vic and military duties took the services and preached Sunday y Sunday during the curate's war-time absence.

Architecturally his supreme reverence was concentrated on the nglish Parish Church. He wrote in the *Berkshire Archaeological Journal* 1925 dealing with the 'Growth of our Old Parish hurches':

> 'I claim for our English parish churches that they are the most interesting relics of the past which remain in our land, far more so than prehistoric antiquities like Stonehenge and Avebury, because the history of these latter is done and we have no share in it. They had their life in the far past; but it was over before what we know of history began, and we know them only as dead relics. Our parish churches, on the other hand, are still what they were when first built—living entities, and now, as then, people go to worship in them as they have done for may be fifteen centuries.' (p.1).

evertheless the breadth of his antiquirian research extended far utside our parish churches, as may be gathered from the follow- g titles of some of his publications: *Wakefield Town Life in e Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (1924); *Sandal Castle* 895); *Monk Bretton Priory* (1926); *The Saxon Earthworks of ofthouse; The History of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society; eventeenth-century History of Medicine in Yorkshire.*

In his old age Walker secured international fame as an ntiquarian by proving, as the result of most intricate research, at the famous outlaw, Robin Hood, is no mere Jack the Giant iller but a veritable historical personage who was born in akefield (Walker even identified the site of his house). Later obin Hood became a domestic servant of Edward II, but return- g to his old ways, met his death as the result of a potion

administered to him by an ecclesiastical lady who seems to have anticipated the hospitable methods of the Borgias.

In Chapter I of the Second Edition of *Wakefield : Its History and People* J. W. Walker cited a sentence which ought to be inscribed on his tomb :

> *'We shall have no To-morrow worth having without a Yesterday worth remembering.'*

His internment took place in Sandal Churchyard where many of his ancestors were buried. The Bishop of Wakefield and the Provost of Wakefield Cathedral officiated at the funeral service.

H.D.A.M.

'DE-MYTHOLOGISING' THE GOSPEL : THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DR. BULTMANN'S UNDERTAKING

By Revd. Professor S. G. F. Brandon, M.A., D.D.,
Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester

I

A RECENT book, bearing the suggestive title of *The Disinherited Mind* has shown how during the last hundred years the works of certain German philosophers, poets and historians have reflected, sometimes prophetically, the spiritual *malaise* of European culture. Professor E. Heller, the author of this book, does not include a German theologian among the subjects of his study, but he might well have done so, since the genius of German religious thought has been quick to divine the basic issues for Christianity in the present century—the names of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner,[1] and Rudolf Otto suffice to indicate the extent of this German contribution both in intuition and suggestion.

A new phase in the activity of this peculiar German genius opened during the late war, and its repercussions are now beginning to be felt in this country.[2] The leading mind in this movement is the veteran New Testament scholar, Professor Rudolf

[1] Professor Brunner may legitimately be included here, although he is a native of Switzerland.

[2] The B.B.C. recently devoted a series of lectures in its Third Programme to Bultmann's thesis. See also J. Henderson, *Myth in the New Testament*. (London, 1952.)

ltmann, who had acquired a considerable reputation shortly er the First World War as an exponent of the then new tech- ue of New Testament research known as the *formgeschicht- he Methode*, or Form Criticism as it came, rather inaccurately, be called here. Professor Bultmann's earlier work[3] had been tinguished by the unrelenting logic of its evaluation of the spels as essentially the traditions of the primitive Christian nmunities which were formed and moulded by the needs of ir contemporary situation. Such an estimate of the Gospels ant that they, and the other New Testament writings, were to understood as setting forth interpretations of the Christian th which were decisively conditioned by the minds of the first ristians, *i.e.* of Palestinian and Hellenised Jews, whose ideas d values were those then current in the eastern Mediterranean ds of the first century of the present era: hence, since Jesus of zareth had written nothing of himself or of his teaching, the ords which we have of his life and message are interpretations second or third-hand, set forth in terms of the concepts of those o made them. The logic of this conclusion could be serenely ed by the student who was concerned merely to evaluate ristianity as a phenomenon of the Graeco-Roman world of the t century, for in terms of historical research the origins of ristianity constitute a problem which differs in no way essen- ly from that, for example, of the origins of Orphism. But to Christian the implications of the conclusion were profoundly turbing, since it meant that in the Gospels he could never be tain that he had the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus nor could he be fident that the portrait of the Master which he found there had been fashioned in the minds of the early disciples by influences er than those of genuine reminiscences of the original 'eye- nesses.' It is the measure of the spiritual sensibility of fessor Bultmann that he did not remain unconscious of the found problem which the historical research, of which he was nself so able an exponent, raised for the faithful Christian, l he set himself to find an answer.

This answer was eventually set forth in an essay entitled *ues Testament und Mythologie;*[4] it has also a sub-title ch is more descriptive of its contents: *Das Problem der tmythologisierung der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung*, a ral rendering of which would read '*The Problem of the De- thologising of the New Testament Preaching.*' The key-word

[3] *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition.* (Göttingen, 1921.)

[4] This essay has been printed in a symposium on Bultmann's position tled *Kerygma und Mythos* (Hamburg, 1948), ed. by H. W. Bartsch.

here is 'de-mythologising' (*Entmythologisierung*), and un doubtedly this has been sufficient in itself to antagonise man people who already regarded Dr. Bultmann as a destructive criti of the New Testament, for the term 'myth' invariably give offence when it is applied as an interpretative category to th Gospel. However, 'myth' (*Mythos*) has a special connotation fo Dr. Bultmann: he regards it as a kind of symbolical representa tion of what are believed to be supernatural truths, the symbol employed being necessarily derived from natural experience Since each of the historic cultures has been concerned to interpre the destiny of Man, which fact has invariably meant relating Ma to God, each culture has had its 'mythical world-picture' (*mythische Weltbild*), which has reflected the genius of tha culture in concept and experience. Accordingly, the first genera tion of Christians partook of a distinctive *mythische Weltbild* which was formulated from ideas which were derived from th religious and philosophical systems then current in the world o Graeco-Roman culture, permeated as that world then was b Oriental and Judaic influences. This is a fact of basic significance the import of which must be fully faced. It means in effect tha the first Christians were predestinated to interpret their experienc of Jesus in terms of the *mythische Weltbild* which they ha inherited by the fact of their birth and upbringing. Professo Bultmann finds in the New Testament two distinct cycles o mythic imagery, namely, Jewish apocalyptic and a Gnosti redemption-myth, and from them are derived the setting an the logic of the New Testament doctrine of salvation throug Christ.[5] These views are not in themselves original; the distinc tiveness of Professor Bultmann's contribution lies in his categori cal denial that the Christian Gospel can be dissociated from it original *mythische Weltbild* and presented in a form consonan with twentieth century thought and experience.[6]

This denial is a matter of profound importance, because i does in effect repudiate as invalid an almost universally accepte principle of Christian exegesis. It would indeed scarcely be a exaggeration to say that almost every appeal made in book o sermon to the example of Jesus of Nazareth or to his teachin tacitly assumes that the instance concerned can be extracted, with out loss of relevancy, from the corpus of tradition in which it i

[5] In *Kerygma und Mythos*, pp. 16—21. Reference should be made for a fuller and better documented account to Bultmann's *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Zürich, 1949); cf. *The Modern Churchman* vol. xli (1951), pp. 32—4.

[6] In *Kerygma und Mythos*, p. 17.

orded and applied as a criterion for judging some issue of ntemporary society. Hence too come those many presentations Jesus and his teaching which claim to distinguish what was of rnal significance from what was contingent, from the temporary sk constituted by the environment of first-century Palestine.[7] th this way of thought Professor Bultmann will have nothing do; he declares:[8] 'The idea of the Saving-event, which forms peculiar content of the New Testament preaching accords h the mythical World-picture.' And this *mythische Weltbild* a strange thing to our modern minds, for on investigation it is nd to be based upon a belief that the present age of the world *on*) is under the domination of daemonic powers, associated h the astral phenomena, and in particular that these powers held nkind in bondage.[9] It was to break the hold of these daemonic ngs that God had determined, before the aeons, to send a sterious pre-existent being, described variously as His Son, the rd (*Kyrios*), and Christos, to be incarnated as a human being d to be crucified, unwittingly, by these astral powers. The way which the accomplishment of this curious plan broke the emonic hold on mankind is not explained; it is considered sufent to describe it as a manifestation of God 'in a mystery.'[10] so unexplained is the identification of the incarnated preistent divine Saviour with the historical Jesus of Nazareth, an ntification which implied that in some way the crucifixion of sus outside the walls of Jerusalem at the decree of the Roman ocurator Pontius Pilate was really the outcome of the blind ion of the daemonic powers, which God had foreordained fore the foundation of the world. The salvation which was ieved by the mysterious death of the divine being who was arnated in the person of the historical Jesus is equally a matter mystery: it is variously described as deliverance from sin, m the consequences of sin, from the wrath of God, and from ath, which is sometimes hypostatised so as to seem a kind of emon. The salvation thus won does not automatically affect ery human being; it has to be apprehended by the individual rson through his faith, its actual mediation being apparently de through a ritual identification of the neophyte with the

[7] In *op. cit.*, pp. 25 sq.

[8] '*Dem mythischen Weltbild entspricht die Darstellung des Heilsgeschehens, das den eigentlich Inhalt der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung bildet,*' in *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[9] In *Kerygma und Mythos*, p. 16; *Das Urchristentum.*, pp. 163—73, 73—3.

[10] I Cor. ii, 6—8. Cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles.* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 109—110, 220—1.

Saviour, in both his death and resurrection, by means of th sacrament of baptism.[11]

This in outline is the *mythische Weltbild* which informs th New Testament interpretation of the nature and mission of Jesu and Dr. Bultmann emphatically maintains that it constitutes a integral whole, so that no attempt at discriminating between wha is regarded as essential and what contingent can be valid—'on can only accept or reject the mythical world-picture as a whole.' Such then is the dilemma which is uncompromisingly defined b Professor Bultmann, and he is equally uncompromising in asse ting the impossibility of attempting to make this original Ne Testament 'mythical world-picture' relevant to our own situation intellectual and emotional, in the twentieth century.[13]

Having thus described this aspect of the intellectual predica ment of Christianity to-day in all its stark reality, Dr. Bultman goes on to suggest his own solution. He is fundamentally con vinced that the Gospel has a unique and enduring value fo mankind, but if this is to be apprehended to-day, there is no othe way than that of 'de-mythologizing' (*zu entmythologisieren*) it The original *Mythos* has to be interpreted, not '*cosmologically*' but '*existentially*,'[14] and the way to do this is indicated in th New Testament itself, which has as its focus of authentication no a doctrine, nor a biography, but an event (*Ereignis*)—an event moreover, which is manifested in a person, namely Jesus, wh may accordingly be himself described as '*das entscheidene Heils ereignis*' ('the decisive Saving-event').[15] But, Dr. Bultmann continues, 'the account of this person is given in mythologica terms. Must then the preaching concerning him be set aside a mythology? That is the question.[16]

In seeking an answer to this question Professor Bultmann prefers first to consider existentially the New Testament teachin about what may be described as 'the human situation.'[17] In thi connection he finds the New Testament concept of the '*flesh*' o key-importance: to him it connotes Man's sinful assumption o the right to, and the exercise of, self-determination (*die Selbst herrlichkeit, die Eigenmächtigheit des Menschen*). This act i the source of the diseased condition of human nature, since it

[11] Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum.*, pp. 219—220.
[12] In *Kerygma und Mythos*, p. 22.
[13] In *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[14] In *op. cit.*, p. 23.
[15] In *op. cit.*, p. 26.
[16] In *op. cit.*, p. 26.
[17] In *op. cit.*, pp. 33 sq.

ders the individual blind to the basic fact of the 'given-ness' his existence, a blindness from which stems the spiritual ladies of modern life, as those once of Graeco-Roman society he *Angst*, the pessimism, hysterical assertions of 'the right to e,' the cult of luck.[18] From this diseased condition recovery n only be had through apprehension of the existential truth of New Testament doctrine of sin and the recognition that God ne can save a man from the curse of self-centredness.[19] It is at s point that Dr. Bultmann perceives a fundamental difference ween a philosophical evaluation of the human situation (he ncerns himself much with the teaching of Karl Jaspers and rtin Heidegger) and the Gospel, because the latter asserts that s by the action of God alone that the life of Man may be tored to its proper state. And here the real crux of the problem omes apparent. Whereas the New Testament picture of the man situation may be 'de-mythologized' and its existential th made clear, the essential saving action of God, the *Heils-chehen*, cannot thus be interpreted, since it is rooted in the torical event of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth.[20] At this nt it would seem that the enquiry has been brought to a sition well-known in Christian apologetic, and it might be sup-sed that Dr. Bultmann would go on from here to expatiate on significance of the historical factor in Christianity, showing that *mythos* after all is firmly anchored in history. But the acuity of Bultmann's thought, as well as his honesty of mind, make h a line of argument (and of escape) impossible for him; for next frankly recognises that the soteriological significance of Crucifixion does not inhere, as it were, in the Cross of us *per se*. The Crucifixion received its meaning from the surrection in the experience of the original disciples; yet the surrection cannot be regarded as providing historical confirma-n of the significance of the Crucifixion, because the 'Resurrec-n is itself an object of faith.'[21] By his sincerity in facing out issue to the end Professor Bultmann is thus brought to an *passe*, which he honestly admits. As he sees it, faith in the surrection generated faith in the Crucifixion as a Salvation-nt (*Heilsereignis*); thus the Cross becomes the Cross of rist, with all the theological implications of that title: other-e the Cross would only be the instrument of the tragic death a noble man. But 'the Easter-event as the Resurrection of

[18] In *op. cit.*, pp. 40—1.
[19] In *op. cit.*, pp. 41—2.
[20] In *op. cit.*, pp. 43—4.
[21] In *op. cit.*, pp. 48—9.

Christ is not an historical event: the Easter-faith of the first disciples can only be regarded as an historical event'—accordingly, when faced with the inevitable question of how are *we* to reach belief in the Cross as an event effecting salvation, Dr. Bultmann can only find one answer: 'because it is preached (*verkündigt*) as such, because it is preached together with the Resurrection. *Christ, the Crucified and the Risen, meets us in the word of the preaching*, and nowhere else.'[22]

Here is the quintessence of Professsor Bultmann's message: it is set forth with an uncompromising simplicity such that it constitutes for those who read it a personal challenge. And its author clearly intends that it should remain absolutely thus, because he immediately proceeds to forestall any attempt to go back and investigate the historical origins of the preaching by the objection that such a procedure would be tantamount 'to wishing to establish faith in the word of God through historical research.'[23] Instead, he urges that our encounter with the preaching of the Gospel is in reality a moment of personal decision in the presence of God—'Belief and unbelief are, therefore, no blind and arbitrary decision, but a responsible affirmation or denial.'[24]

II

The interpretation which Professor Bultmann here offers clearly lays itself open to two obvious objections. The first may be described as *theological*: if the individual's salvation depends upon his response on the occasion of his encounter with the Gospel, is not some doctrine of predestination thus tacitly assumed? The second objection is *historical* by nature: Dr. Bultmann refers to the preaching of the Gospel (*Verkündigung*) as though the New Testament documents reveal the existence of a definitive body of doctrine universally taught and received throughout the Primitive Church; but a critical examination of those documents shows that quite a different situation obtained, namely, that within two decades of the Crucifixion two rival interpretations of the person and mission of Jesus were current in the Church. However, since the present writer has elaborated these

[22] In *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[23] In *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[24] '*Glaube und Unglaube sind deshalb nicht blinder, willkürlicher Entschluss, sondern verstehendes Ja oder Nein.*' See also Bultmann's contribution to *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne* (*Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*), Neuchatel-Paris, 1950, p. 34.

jections elsewhere,[25] he does not intend to pursue them here, ..., instead, to discuss the important subject of the significance Professor Bultmann's undertaking in the context of a vital ue for Christian thought to-day.

Until within the last few years (and indeed still existent in pular thought) there has been a confident appeal to what has en termed the historicity of Christianity.[26] The term has rarely en defined with exactitude, but its general meaning has been dent in an abundance of reference and allusion. It embodies claim that Christianity, in contradistinction to other religions, rooted in history; that Christianity took its rise, and consently derives its authentication, from certain events which pened in Palestine during the first four decades of the present . This claim, which was put in the forefront of Christian ologetics as one of its most powerful arguments, seems to have en a product of the earlier phases of liberalist historical scholarp in which the majority of the New Testament documents were ablished as writings which were composed before the end of first century and thus were apparently trustworthy records of events which they relate. But its inherent logic did not permit torical research to rest in this position, and, even while the late . B. H. Streeter's magisterial book *The Four Gospels* was ng digested in this country, New Testament scholars in rmany had gone behind the written sources to investigate the e-literary stage of the formation of the primitive Christian tradin and the word 'Form-Criticism' began to annoy and perplex se who felt that Streeter's great work provided an adequate nmary of all that needed to be known about the origins of the damental records.[27] However, the spirit of enquiry could not stayed and historians were ever intent on applying new and cter criteria in investigation. This unceasing quest has dered the field of Christian Origins a veritable morass of contly changing expert opinion; and of this opinion the most

[25] In *The Hibbert Journal*, vol. li (January, 1953), art. 'Myth and the spel.'

[26] cf. C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London, 1935), pp. 15 sq.; C. J. Webb, *The Historical Element in Religion* (London, 1935), p. 36; Bevan, *Christianity* (London, 1938), pp. 35—6; O. Cullman, *Christus die Zeit* (Zürich, 1946), pp. 15, 16—17; H. D. Wendland, *Geschichtschauung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen, 8), pp. 5—9; R. Mehl in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, tx (1950), pp. 107—8.

[27] Interest in 'Form-Criticism' soon showed itself in England; cf. K. L. Clarke, *New Testament Problems* (London, 1929), pp. 18—30; Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.* (London, 1931.)

impressive feature seems to be the increasing recognition of the extent of our inevitable ignorance about the fundamental factors of the original movement.[28]

As the current position in a field of historical enquiry this situation can be viewed with equanimity because a parallel situation could be found in many other fields of research; indeed it may be reckoned a sign of the vitality of historical scholarship that the data relevant to any particular subject be constantly interrogated. But such equanimity cannot be felt by Christian scholars, who must always ultimately be concerned with the bearing of their researches on the life of the Church of which they are themselves members. Accordingly, signs are not wanting of a devoloping consciousness that the appeal to its historical origins is not in the best interests of the faith,[29] that the emphasis upon historicity is proving itself to be, not the strongest arm of the Christian apologist, but a treacherous weapon calculated to exhaust the strength of those who use it and confuse their faith.

It would seem that it is in this context that the thesis of Dr. Bultmann is to be set; and its contextual significance is surely enhanced by the fact that Dr. Bultmann himself has been one of the most distinguished exponents of radical historical investigation into the primitive sources of Christianity. Thus it would appear that this attempt to 'demythologize' the Gospel, with its absolute emphasis on the quality of the individual's instinctive reaction when confronted with the Gospel and its concomitant refusal to permit enquiry into the origins of the 'preaching', is in effect a *repudiation of the appeal to history* and a proclamation that *the truth of Christianity is essentially existential and can only be apprehended by personal experience.*

III

While one must respect the truly religious fervour which inspires Dr. Bultmann's undertaking, it does nevertheless seem necessary to ask whether the problem which has provoked it is not essentially an artificial one, in that it has been created by an earlier misunderstanding of the nature of the historical element in Primitive Christianity.

[28] '*Tous ces débuts de l'Église chrétienne sont si incertains et si obscurs que presque chaque fois que l'exégète se risque à une affirmation, il aperçoit tout aussitôt une raison de la contredire.*' Ch. Guignebert, *Le Christ* (Paris, 1943), p. 90.

[29] The question might fairly be raised as to whether this may not be a factor in the recent pre-occupation of Anglican scholarship with liturgical and doctrinal studies to the apparent neglect of major work in the field of Christian Origins.

In retrospect this suggested error is easily intelligible. The e of the comparative study of religion about a century ago ckly began to reveal the apparent historical interest implicit many of the New Testament writings in contrast to the lack historical concern manifest in the sacred books of other ligions. The Gospels and the *Acts of the Apostles* seemed to modern Western mind, with its profound interest in historical gins, to constitute the most concrete evidence of a primitive ristian preoccupation with historical fact. Accordingly, as we ve seen, Christian scholarship, particularly in the field of ologetics, began to lay increasing emphasis upon this aspect the faith. But this interpretation of the so-called historicity of mitive Christianity can be shown on examination to have been staken: a lively interest in the historical environment of the ginnings of the faith is indeed manifest in certain of the New stament documents, but this interest did not originally prevail the circle where the foundations of Christian soteriology were d and its later literary expression was the outcome of a conflict forces within the Church which were only resolved after A.D. 70. e issue involved here is extremely complicated, and, since it been treated at length by the present writer elsewhere,[30] a mmary statement may now suffice.

The evidence of St. Paul's Epistles, which provide our eliest information of the Christian faith, *discloses a soteriology wing only the slightest reference to the historical data; for thority this soteriology appeals to spiritual experience.* Opposed this Pauline interpretation was the teaching of the Church of usalem in which Jesus was set forth as the Jewish Messiah; ce this teaching was chiefly expounded in a series of illustrative cdotes, an apparent interest was shown in the historical vironment. The *fusion of the Pauline and Jerusalem doctrines* sequent on the upheaval of Christian life which was caused the Jewish War against Rome in A.D. 66 to 70 found its first pression in the Gospel of Mark, which provided the impetus the composition of the other Gospels and *Acts*, thus affording parent evidence of historical concern; but the motive thereof s the desire to reconcile two venerated but diverse traditions t not appreciation of historicity. Indeed it can be shown that early Christians, instead of emphasizing the fact that their h took its rise from events which had happened in Palestine he recent past, were embarrassed by the novelty of their origins l eagerly sought to lay claim to a greater antiquity on the

[30] In *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London, 1951) and *e and Mankind* (London, 1951), chap. 8.

ground that the Church was the rightful heir to the venerable heritage of Israel.[31]

If further consideration of the New Testament documents thus shows that the early Christians did not value the historicity of the origins of their faith and that for them authentication was found in spiritual experience and not in historical data, consideration of the concept of historical fact itself also indicates *the artificial nature of the problem* which the thesis of Dr. Bultmann is designed to solve or to circumvent.

The positivist idea of history, which found its classic expression in Ranke's dictum that the past should be recorded 'as it really happened' (*'wie es eigentlich gewesen'*),[32] not unnaturally came to exercise a profound influence upon the aims of New Testament research. The ideal sought by analysis of the Gospel sources was that of being able to identify with confidence first-hand reports of Jesus, it being assumed that such reports would give the historical facts, that they would tell exactly what happened on a specific occasion. But this idea has progressively been shown to be an illusion; for not only have New Testament scholars found it impossible to identify with certainty any such first-hand reports, but certain philosophers have exposed the fallacies implicit in the corresponding concept of historical fact. Benedetto Croce set out to show that 'history is thought' (*'la storia è pensieró'*),[33] because

> 'in thought, reality and quality, existence and essence, are all one, and it is not possible to affirm a fact to be real without at the same time knowing what that fact may be, *i.e.*, with qualifying it.'[34]

And in similar vein the late Professor R. G. Collingwood writes:[35]

> 'Unlike the natural scientist, the historian is not concerned with events at all. He is only concerned with those events which are the outward expression of thought, and is only concerned with these in so far as they express thoughts.'

In other words, there has been a growing recognition of the

[31] See *Time and Mankind*, pp. 169—170.

[32] In *Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker*, preface to the first ed. (*Werke*, Leipzig, 1874, vol. xxxiii-xxxiv, p. viii); cf. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, I, i, p. 200.

[33] *Teoria e Storia della Storiografia* (Bari, 5th ed., reveduta, 1943), p. 49; cf. p. 57.

[34] *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[35] *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1946), p. 215; cf. pp. 282—3, 293; cf. H. D. Oakeley, *History and the Self* (London, 1934), pp. 17, 77 sq., 97; M. Oakeshott, *Experience and its Modes* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 91, 92—8, 101, 110—1; *Philosophy and History* (ed. R. Klibansky and H. J. Paton, Oxford, 1936), pp. 5, 6, 7 (J. Huizinga), 140—2, 151 (F. Medicus), 257, 258—9 (E. Wind).

ientiality of the factor of interpretation in all records of events. is means that, so far as literary records are concerned, we can y know the past in each instance through the medium of some id which discerned something significant in the complex of enomena then presented to its senses, this significance being turn expressed in the categories with which that mind was nished by its education.

The consequences of this re-evaluation of historical fact for understanding of Christian Origins are of great importance. the light of them it is seen that we cannot make direct contact ough the Gospels with the so-called 'Jesus of History'; tead we have to do with varying interpretations of the historical us which were inspired in the minds of various men by their perience of him.[36] And this is not all. We have to notice and y reckon with the fact that the greatest mind among the New stament writers probably had no personal experience of the torical Jesus. Yet Paul, who set little store on knowledge of rist 'according to the flesh,'[37] clearly lived in so close a mystic on with Christ that he could declare that 'no longer live I, but rist liveth in me,'[38] his whole life and thought bearing witness he reality of the experience for him.

Then it must be rememberd that, not only Paul but the hor of the Fourth Gospel was concerned, as the episode of doubting Thomas shows,[39] with the problem of knowing Jesus he Risen Saviour after his physical presence was withdrawn. th was distinguished by him also as the quality which made knowledge possible; and in process of time theologians came write long and intricate treatises on the origins and nature of quality. But faith seems on reflection to be but a convenient n to cover our ignorance of the origins of the existential fact, nely, that generation after generation of Christians have been vinced that they have held communion with Jesus and have d inspired by that conviction. Moreover, as the New stament writings reveal a diversity of interpretation of the ure and rôle of Jesus, so the experience of Christians down centuries has continued to produce still other interpretations. ssed in review these interpretations may at first bewilder and n perhaps scandalize by what may seem to us some bizarre or eign feature—the Jewish Messiah, Paul's pre-existent Saviour,

[36] See the present writer's article 'The Logic of New Testament icism' in *The Hibbert Journal*, vol. xlvii (1948—9).
[37] II Cor. v, 16.
[38] Gal. ii, 20.
[39] John xii, 24-29.

the awful *Pantokrator* of the Apocalypse, the divine Logos of John, the beardless youth of the Good Shepherd statue now in the Lateran Museum, the majestic figure in the mosaic apse of many a Byzantine church, the Crucified Victim of Western European art, the Christ-figures of Leonardo and Michelangelo, the Good Shepherd of the Victorian stained-glass window, the idyllic figure of Ernest Renan, Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, Thorwaldsen's statue, the 'One Unknown' of Albert Schweitzer—the list could be extended indefinitely. Each conception demands our respect, even though we may not always comprehend it; for each expresses an experience of the original Jesus of Nazareth. And therein surely lies the answer to the 'quest of the historical Jesus'—each generation of Christians will conceive of him according to its experience and in terms of the categories of its culture. The relativism thus implied may at first sight seem shocking, yet on reflection it will be noted that it is tempered by the fact that the Christian conscience has always detected concepts of its Lord which are false or inadequate from those, no matter how strange or seemingly crude, which reflect a genuine experience of him who can be known by Jew and Gentile, by Barbarian and Scythian, by bond and free. Accordingly, it would seem that, while Dr. Bultmann's attempt to 'de-mythologize' the Gospel has its value in showing the existential truth of the soteriology implied, however, the crucial fact must not be overlooked that in the New Testament there is no one single interpretation of the person and work of Jesus Christ which can be claimed as uniquely authentic, but from the beginning the richness of Christ's personality inspired varying interpretations as men of diverse genius recognised him as their Lord.

SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND*

By Sir John Stewart-Wallace, C.B., Vice-President of World Congress of Faiths

YOUNGHUSBAND was of a world that has passed away, the brilliant Edwardian age. That was an era of immense wealth, great country houses, unnumbered servants, hunting, shooting, fishing, dances, dinner-parties, blazing jewels, exquisite dresses—and low taxation with golden sovereigns seemingly as fixed in value as the Himalayas.

**Francis Younghusband: Explorer and Mystic* by George Seaver, Litt.D. (John Murray, 1953; 25/-.)

Born in 1863 of a long line of distinguished soldiers at the station of Meerut, the call of the eternal snows was his from h. Educated at Clifton, he developed a hardness of physique a toughness of moral purpose destined to carry him to where te men had never been before. He was an imperialist of the torian school. He conceived of England and Englishmen as chosen instruments of Providence to bear the White Man's den of governing subordinate and less favoured nations. And not in pride but in humility; not by swagger and bullying but nflexibly doing justice and equity between man and man. He r felt himself to be the representative of mighty England the Great White Queen. His ideal was in danger, hardship difficulty to bear himself accordingly. Some may whisper him ave been an individualist and an autocrat. But, if he were, ad the high qualities of lesser defects.

After Clifton he was commissioned in the King's Dragoon ards at Meerut when the King's Dragoons were the very ing of the gods. Peace-time soldiering, however, did not fill urge in him to great things. The Himalayas called to the born lorer determined to explore. Opportunity knocks on the door determination. Regimental difficulties were overcome. With benediction of high authority, he went exploring for the vernment in Manchuria. Manchuria was followed by his recedented trek across the torrid Gobi desert. Then came crossing of the Himalayas by the Mustagh Pass. This feat ed him among the world's great explorers and brought the gratulations of Commanders-in-Chief, his elevation at twenty- to lecturing to the Royal Geographical Society in London to becoming its youngest Fellow. Expeditions of national ortance in the Himalayas followed, demanding powers of sical endurance and moral determination almost incredible. n came his mission to Chitral when, combining the function orrespondent to *The Times* and Political Agent of Govern- t, he again carried the mission to success. So fully was he in the saddle to fame that *The Times* sent him as correspon- t to South Africa at the period of the Jameson Raid, Cecil des and President Kruger. He was in authoritative touch ast with world events, high policy and history making per- lities. He so conducted himself in these great affairs that in the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, entrusted him with the historic ion to hostile and occult Tibet. There he had to act both soldier and envoy in circumstances unforeseen and unparal- d. He triumphed. And that in spite of frustrations and delays out by Dr. Seaver in sixty fascinating pages. In those pages

is also given the inner history of the K.C.I.E. and K.C.S.I. conferred on Younghusband, and of the official censure that for him poisoned the gift. Never at ease with the inevitable restraints of Government Service, he now determinted to retire and to seek his own path in fields that had long called him.

Had Sir Francis been merely a world explorer Dr. Seaver would probably never have written his biography. Explorers have their day and quickly pass. But he was something more. He felt the mystery of life and, seeking for its meaning and purpose, gradually evolved a wider view than that of dogmatic theology. He had come of parents unchallengingly conventional in the Church of England. Their religion had never been for him, however, a living faith. More and more, he tells us, dogmatic theology and ecclesiasticism obtruded themselves as barriers to the understanding of an all loving and universal Power. At nineteen he could no longer accept the unique divinity of Christ, though more and more he came to venerate him as the greatest of the prophets and an embodiment of the divine. His outlook was almost of necessity wider than that of any of the national Faiths, springing as it did from his living with and being dependent for his life on men of many faiths, Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian, Moslem. These, he knew, were fine men who wanted to be good and *were* good. Many so truly religious that he perceived that behind all these faiths there was a fundamental unity, the very essence of religion, embracing them all in the universality of its saving grace.

Among the orthodox beliefs he outgrew was also that in a special Providence, momentarily intervening in human affairs. As Lord Samuel has pointed out there is no reason for denying that such divine intervention may be fact, but were it frequent, overt and explicit man's freedom of choice, and with it his responsibility as a being capable of rising to the divine, would be gone. The reticence of God in this regard may be His supreme gift to man. Sir Francis believed in Providence indeed, but in one directing our whole being, and directing it towards the life in the Spirit that leads us back to Himself. In this deep sense Younghusband was a believer in the mystical apprehension of God, and it is common to call him a mystic. Dr. Seaver indeed does so in the sub-title of his book. It is in no way, however, to challenge the height and depth of Younghusband's spiritual life to doubt if he were a mystic in the sense that the great religious contemplatives, Christian, Hindu or Sufi, have been. There are clearly different levels of mystical experience. We dare even hope, *Gloria in Excelsis*, that those glimmerings, faint and fitful, of the Reality

effable, the most attained by most of us, are in some far off y akin to the ONENESS with God of a St. John of the Cross or a makrishna. We speak of a poetic vision, we distinguish ween psychic and mystic experience. Which of these was unghusband's experience on the mountain-side overlooking asa, commonly referred to as his mystic experience? That perience came to him after following a path very different from t pointed out by the great Masters. They tell us the great perience is something only attained after victory over the lusts the body, and the lures of the mind, fame, wealth, power, ldly success. The detachment from all such things must be ire; the concentration on the Divine must be one-pointed and nplete. Even then St. John of the Cross tells us the dark night the soul may be long. For many the dawn may not come in s mortal life. In the case of Sir Francis, his mountain-side perience was preceded by no such world renunciation. On the trary he had just carried to triumph a world endeavour and d been world acclaimed a hero. Telegrams of congratulation l poured into Lhasa from the Viceroy conveying the appre- ion of his King, from the Secretary of State for India, from rd Kitchener and Lord Roberts and many other of the great he world. Filled with all this he tells us :—

> 'I went off alone to the mountain-side and there gave myself up to all the emotions of this eventful time . . . I was naturally elated at having brought to a successful issue a most difficult and dangerous mission . . . But now grew up in me something infinitely greater than mere elation and good will. Elation grew to exultation and exultation to exaltation, which thrilled through me with overpowering intensity . . . I had visions of a far greater religious faith yet to be, and of a God as much greater than our English God as a Himalayan giant is greater than an English hill.'

This was a high and holy vision indeed, but in it God appears have still been something other than himself. His highest m for it is that 'in those fleeting moments God is made real us,' and he warns that all too soon the vision is 'blurred in the ualities of common life.'

Such an experience is high, life-converting and known to d, but is it *the* mystic experience of which the Masters tells us? at experience where all sense of separateness and individuality ost in the supra-consciousness of unity with the ONE. So over- elming is the otherness of the final Union, that the greatest ld work has by some of the Masters been abandoned, as if it e but a careless trifle. Younghusband was not emancipated by experience from very normal human frailties. Within a few s of it, Dr. Seaver tells us, 'he was seething with indignation'

over the snub (as he regarded it) of the K.C.I.E., though followed by the K.C.S.I., and the official censure (wholly undeserved as he thought) passed on him by the Secretary of State.

Sir Francis was great enough, however, quickly to forget matters in the life of the spirit so petty. His reaction was to devote himself to giving to the world such religious message as he felt himself to have. And for his message the world was singularly ready. The era of separated nations, and of religions unknown to and unstudied by one another, was passing with the passing of the XIX Century. Geographical distance was being annihilated. International understanding was being fostered by great International Expositions of the Arts and Crafts. Already in 1893 the great Chicago World's Fair had been held. Some religious genius had even had the inspiration to add to the Fair a 'World's Parliament of Religions,' where representatives of the world religions might meet one another, and in the meeting promote human brotherhood and peace. It is safe to say that the mainly Christian promoters did not foresee the bombshell to be burst on orthodoxy by an unknown Hindu monk, the Swami Vivekananda. His first speech took the Parliament by storm. He did not speak as in apology of a heathen idolatry (as at that time most Christians believed non-Christian religions to be) but, in the highest charity for all, as a prophet of the one God of all mankind and of a religion four millenia old. He pointed to a God higher than the theologies of the dividing religions of the world. He transcended the particular faiths in his call to the worship of the ONE, to whom all these Faiths were but paths. His gospel was universalism.

All this had, in all seeming, providentally prepared the way for Younghusband, who threw himself into this great movement towards a world fellowship in religion with all his power and world-wide influence. In 1924 he became Chairman of a newly formed society in London for promoting the Study of Religions. At its opening meeting, he proclaimed his message of universal religious understanding. Thereafter he was constantly invited to address meetings in sympathy with his message throughout England and the United States. Finally he was asked to organise a Great Congress in London in 1936, as the acme of the movement now seeking to be world wide. Most willingly he undertook the task, which eventually led to his formation of the present World Congress of Faiths.

Sir Francis's ideal for the new Society was that it should be all embracing. Not only all denominations of Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims and all other Faiths should meet together

holy fellowship and dedicated search for truth, but (not always nembered) he equally sought '*the contributions of those who ofessed no creed but who had a deep faith of their own and who their deeds promoted that faith.*' A generation ago this was a h vision. Merely to assemble on a common platform at a Great ngress accredited representatives of all the World Religions, d to give each the opportunity, as an equal in the search for d, to expound the high and holy message enshrined in his n particular Faith was a truly moving step forward in a great vance. But a first step is necessarily limited. In the very nature things, at such a Congress each representative tends in a public dress to dwell on the salvation, truth and beauty contained in own Faith, rather than on the over-arching and under-pinning ONENESS behind and above them all. Yet that ONENESS, that gnificent harmony of a thousand truths, is, as Sir Francis saw the essential message of and for the World Congress of Faiths. ere juxtaposition was a great step forward in its day but, like riotism, it is ultimately not enough. This generation is ready the forward step, so eagerly sought by Sir Francis, in a way dreamt of in his time. The distinguishing tenets, philosophies d theologies of the various Faiths are now widely understood. deeper knowledge of the East has been given to the West by ny missions, visits, lectures, translations and much study. ere is to-day a richer insight into a new vision—the vision of various Faiths, in their meeting, coming to *transcend* their fering theologies, and in transcending, to penetrate to the ring knowledge of God—those depths where all symbols and ologies shrink into irrelevancies in the uplifted consciousness the Eternal. Sir Francis did not live to see the coming of the ith that is YET TO BE.

RATIONALISM, NEO-HINDUISM, OR CHRISTIANITY?

By Dr. E. C. Dewick, Sometime Canon of Nagpur
and author of *The Christian Attitude to other Religions*, etc.

TWO recent books bring two challenges to the Christian Church, from opposite sides. One[1] attacks religion in every form, as irrational superstition; the other[2] emphasizes the vital importance of religion, but claims that the *Vedanta* philosophy of Hinduism, if interpreted in a 'modernist' way, offers to mankind a religion more adequate for present day needs than historic Christianity.

Let us turn first to Sir E. Kennaway's *Religious Illusions*. He begins with the confident assertion that 'only *one* description of the universe can be true' (p. 3); and that is, a description based solely on the 'scientific' observation of physical phenomena. But can this 'dogma' be accepted without question? If true, it would rule out the validity, not only of *religious* experience, but of *artistic* experience too. For while physical science can analyse and describe some of the elements in a work of art (such as the size, weight, and colours of a painting, or the sound-waves that transmit the melody of music), it cannot 'describe' the artist's sense of beauty, nor prove whether this does or does not correspond to truth. A Rationalism such as Sir Ernest Kennaway's would deprive us of all confidence in life's higher values, artistic as well as religious, and would leave only a barren intellectualism. Is this a necessary consequence of the scientific attitude? Sir Ernest Kennaway is an eminent scientist; but a scientist no less eminent, Prof. J. A. Thomson, has expressed a very different—and, we venture to think, a no less truly 'scientific'—view in his *Introduction to Science*, in the Home University Library:

> 'The answers of science with regard to Nature and Man are very far from being complete . . . Even if they were complete, they would not satisfy the whole nature of the ordinary man . . . We get hints of complementary answers, in poetic and religious feeling, and we see no reason to believe that the only approach to Truth and Reality is by the scientific method' (p. 219).

[1] *Some Religious Illusions in Art, Literature and Experience*, by Sir Ernest Kennaway. (Watts & Co.; 10/6.)

[2] *Vedanta for Modern Man*, ed. by C. Isherwood. (G. Allen & Unwin 25/-.)

The strong prejudice against religion, which is patent in most every page of Sir Ernest Kennaway's book, is evidently, part, a reaction against the narrow Anglican dogmatism in ch (as he tells us) he was brought up (p. 12). But this reaction, ugh fully justified up to a point, seems to have distorted his gment so far that he is incapable of a fair estimate of any kind religion. He rakes up from the past the most grotesque per-sions of religion—the lurid pictures of Hell in mediaeval nting—the fantastic legends of miracles worked by the saints—speculations as to the geographical locality of Heaven (pp. 12, ., 45ff.); and having easily demolished these, he seems to ık he has demolished religion as a whole. If a similar argument e adopted with regard to science, it might equally well be tended that because men of science have in the past held views t are now discarded, therefore science as a whole is unworthy credit. Both arguments are fallacious, because they make no wance for *growth* in knowledge.

There are indeed some points at which Sir Ernest's attack is ctive. We agree with him that the language of our Creeds and icles is in many places out of date and misleading; and that argument of the 'Black Rubric' in the Prayer Book, that hrist's natural flesh and blood are now in heaven,' and *there-*e cannot also be on earth, is crudely materialistic (p. 4). We agree that any claim for 'infallibility,' whether on behalf of le or Church, is contrary to the sound scientific principle that human judgments must be open to revision, if this is required further knowledge. Churches which make such claims, or st on retaining such doctrinal statements, are needlessly laying mselves open to legitimate scientific criticism.

But in this book, religion, in any and every form—Greek, yptian, Muslim, Christian—is dismissed as 'nothing but a eless chaos of contradiction, and an endless morass of usion' (p. 5). The hope of immortality is rejected as mere shful thinking' (p. 23); and as for Jesus Christ, his teaching lenounced as 'unscientific,' and in places 'horrible,' inspired 'savage vengeance' (pp. 25, 87). Such judgments indicate inability to recognize a *symbolic* value in any language or ture that is not 'scientifically' accurate. For instance, the erences in the text to the illustrations in the book (some of ch are beautiful reproductions in colour of well-known paint-s) are few, and generally depreciatory. The Italian paintings Christ's Resurrection are dismissed with the remark: 'Could thing be more prosaic?' (p. 31). It seems to us that this ective could more properly be applied to the attitude of this

book than to these works of art and words of religion, which ar here rejected as 'illusions,' but which may more wisely be wel comed as efforts of the human spirit to express (through *medi* admittedly imperfect) man's awareness of 'things unseen an eternal.'

A reader who turns from Kennaway's *Religious Illusions* t Isherwood's *Vedanta for Modern Man* will probably feel tha his experience is similar to that of Alice when she went *Throug the Looking-Glass*. Nearly all the value-judgments of the on seem to be reversed in the other; 'good' becomes 'bad' an 'white' becomes 'black.'

Vedanta for Modern Man is a sequel to *Vedanta for th Western World*, which Christopher Isherwood also edited, i 1948; and both volumes follow the same plan, of a series of shor essays by various writers, Eastern and Western, who share a common faith in the value of Hindu *Vedanta* as the highes expression of the religious spirit in man. The extreme brevity of the sixty-three essays (most of them covering only three to si pages) does not offer the writers much scope for developing thei themes, and gives the volume a somewhat 'disjointed' character But a unity of purpose is evident throughout, and follows th lines laid down by Mr. Isherwood in his Preface to *Vedanta fo the Western World*, where he defines the main principles o *Vedanta* as follows:

(1) Man's real nature is divine;
(2) The aim of human life is to realize this;
(3) All religions are essentially in agreement;
(4) The Vedantist must learn the lesson: 'Cease to be yourself,' an seek union with the Supreme Brahman;
(5) Brahman has nothing to do with our standards of good and evil.

So, while Kennaway regards Religion as a pernicious illusion the Vedantist holds it to be the one and only thing of real value while Kennaway condemns all forms of religion as equally *foolish* the Vedantist maintains that they are all equally *true;* while Kennaway charges Christianity with being too superstitious, the Vedantist chides the Christian for being too *chary* of accepting divine revelations and supernatural manifestations in many quarters.

At many points, the Vedantist and the Christian will find themselves at one. They will agree that materialism is inadequate as an explanation of the facts of life. Isherwood's essay 'Religion without Prayers' (pp. 28-33), in which he criticizes the Rationalistic Humanism of Prof. Edman, might be adopted by a Christian as an effective answer to Sir Ernest Kennaway. Even Jawarharla

ru, India's Prime Minister, though himself largerly agnostic natters of religion, admits the inadequacy of materialism n he says :

'I am a man of earth and of politics, not dabbling much in spiritual natters . . . Nevertheless I do feel that our life would become much poorer in quality if that spiritual element were lacking' (pp. 122-127).

Many Christians will also endorse the Vedantist emphasis on essential unity between God and man. This is vehemently diated by our modern Barthians. But Aldous Huxley, the antist, quotes with appreciation the words of William Law, Christian :

'To what purpose could this precept [to love God] be given to man, nless he essentially partook of the divine nature?' (p. 172).

The writers in this volume constantly appeal to Christians to don the claim that Divine Revelation is to be found only e Judaeo-Christian tradition (pp. xiii, 290, 299, etc.). Even will find an echo in the hearts of many 'liberal' Christians, would largely agree with Rabindra Nath Tagore's denun- on of 'religious imperialism' (p. 81). But we think they d all wish to add that, while true religion cannot be *posed'* on others, it can be, and indeed must be, '*shared'* others.

Side by side with these valuable points of contact, there are e fundamental antitheses between Vedantism and Christianity, of the most liberal type. The chief of these are courteously clearly set forth by Swami Siddheswarananda, in his essay *Hindu View of Christian Theology* (pp. 299-319), as follows :

1. The Vedantist 'welcomes and venerates' many incarnations of he Divine ; Christian doctrine, only *one*.
2. The Vedantist seeks Salvation from *ignorance;* the Christian, Salvation from *sin*.
3. To the Vedantist, the highest conception of God is *impersonal;* o the Christian, it is *personal,* or it may be, '*super-personal.*'
4. To the Vedantist, his life on this earth is but one of many, preceding it and following it : the Christian believes he will pass through his world only once.
5. The faith of the Vedantist is not based on any particular historical events ; Christian faith, on a historical Person.

The differences are obviously not superficial, but fundamental ; although some of the writers in this volume assure us that re is no antagonism between Vedanta and other religions' 3), it is significant that Islam is throughout ignored, as though ere unworthy of attention, and Christianity is regarded as a

religion which the modern world has 'outgrown' (p. 2). In h Introduction, Isherwood writes:

> 'As far as organized Christianity is concerned, Vedanta would see to have very little chance of a hearing. Vedanta does challenge t Church's claim to central importance' (p. xii).

He thinks, however, that the Society of Friends offers 'one litt door through which Vedanta might squeeze into Christendom We should be interested to know whether our Quaker frien would agree with this.

So much for the Vedantist estimate of Christianity. What the Christian estimate of Vedanta? To the Christian, it appea to have serious weaknesses.

1. Its 'pure spirituality' (p. 8) is too 'bodiless' to meet the mo and religious needs of man as he is. It may appeal to a small cir of intellectuals or mystics; it has no 'Good News' for the ordinary ma

2. Its conception of God as 'The All,' 'beyond all attributes,' a therefore beyond 'good' and 'evil,' undercuts the final authority of a moral principles. An example of this is the Bengali mystic Ramakrish Paramahamsa, who in this volume is constantly held up as a supre example of one who actually attained union with God (pp. xi, 167, 2 etc.). Now Ramakrishna's character was a strange 'blend of opposite On the one hand, he had great charm and tenderness; but at times l language was filthy, and he was completely indifferent to moral e (J. N. Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India,* pp. 190 f May not this have been due, at least in part, to his Vedantism? F Ramakrishna's supreme devotion was to the goddess Kali, who (we re 'in Her left hands holds a man's severed head, and a sword, and wi Her right hands offers boons and benedictions to Her devotees' (p. 22 Now in most types of religion, the mind of the worshipper tends to influenced by the character of the Object of his worship; and this m well have been the case with Ramakrishna. If so, would any Christi wish to be conformed to the image of Kali, rather than 'to grow up in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ?'

3. A third weakness of Vedantism, in Christian eyes, is its disrega for the facts of history and science. We have criticized Sir Erne Kennaway for his refusal to recognize any 'facts' *beyond* physic phenomena; but it is no less dangerous to *ignore* such facts. The cont butors to this volume seem to build their theories entirely on 'ideas' dogmas, such as the TAT TVAM ASI ('Thou art God') of the Vedant or deities whose existence is unknown to historians, such as Kali Krishna. This method lifts them out of the reach of historical or scie tific criticism, but it also takes away all restraints against extravaga cies of speculation or superstition. The 'Christ' whom the Vedanti professes to venerate is very loosely related to Jesus of Nazareth. T Vedantist (we are told) must 'take Christ out of his historical setti and build a new theology' (p. 306). Such a nebulous figure as th cannot hold in Vedantism the central position which 'Jesus Chris crucified under Pontius Pilate,' holds in the faith of the Christian.

For these and other reasons we do not think that man Christians will agree with the claim that the Vedantism of th

me offers a religion more adequate for modern needs than of the Christian Church. But Christians may learn from it h that is of value. Perhaps we Westerns need, most of all, y to heart the call to 'serenity' amid life's ups and downs which the Vedantist lays so much stress. This is, indeed, icit in the message of Our Lord: 'Be not anxious for the row'; 'Let not your heart be troubled'; and it has been derfully manifest in the lives of some of his noblest disciples. with most of us it is obscured by the stress and strain, fume fret of modern life—often with regard to things of no lasting ortance. We may wisely learn, even from *Vedanta*, some- g more of 'The Peace of God, which passeth all understand-

MAIMONIDES AND TO-DAY

By Rev. C. J. Wright, Ph.D., Rector of Barfreystone

MOSES BEN MAIMON, usually known as Maimonides, the leading Jewish thinker of the Middle Ages and one c the influential religious philosophers of his time and place. E Jews it used to be said of him: 'From Moses to Moses ther arose none like Moses'—meaning, from Moses to Mose Mendelssohn, the eighteenth-century philosopher, there aros none like Moses Maimonides.

He was born in Cordova in 1135, some nine years after th birth in the same town of his very famous and influential Spanis Muslim contemporary, Averroes. Here is a reminder, in moder days when the relations between Arab and Jew are in many way and spheres so tense and bitter, of the centuries when Islam an Judaism met in mutual cultural esteem: nor can instructe Christians forget that this intercourse profoundly influence Christian mediaeval universities and Catholic Schoolmen. It also stimulating to recall, in days when medical science is probin more and more deeply into the mysteries of life and matter, tha most of the thinkers of the Hebraeo-Arabic group in the Middl Ages practised as physicians: to give but four outstandin examples—two Jews and two Arabs—Isaac Judaeus, Avicenna Averroes, and Maimonides.

Politics and religion—then as now—were historically related each affected the other, for good and for ill. Thus, the rise of fanatical Islamic dynasty, resting on the *Quran* and on Dogmatic (that is, on a Book and its final interpretation), drove man liberals from Spain: among them the family of the youn Maimonides. They came to Morocco, where also Averroes lived and thence to Fostat, the ancient Cairo. Here, Maimonides, th erudite expositor of the Talmud, became a commentator on th aphorism of Hippocrates and a Court physician to Saladin. Hi fame reached Richard Coeur de Lion at Ascalon during th Third Crusade, who offered him, in vain, a post at the Englis Court. Maimonides died in 1204 and was buried, it is said, i Tiberias in Palestine.

His enduring memorial is *The Guide of the Perplexed*.[1] T the modern world of thought, Maimonides, the expositor of th

[1] Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*. An abridged edition, wit Introduction and Commentary by Julius Guttmann. Translated from th Arabic by Chaim Rabin. (Philosophia Judaica series; East and West Library 1952; 21/-.)

almud, is dead, but the liberal thinker, who spoke in and rough this book, lives on. The present translation is therefore be warmly welcomed. It will, I hope, serve to kindle, or -kindle, among forward-looking Christians and those of other iths an interest in the Jewish 'modernism' of the Middle Ages: hasten, I trust, the day of mutual understanding among ligious people of East and West: and thus to prepare for a rger, fuller and deeper apprehension of eternal Truth. It was t for nought, surely, that Islam, Judaism and Christianity met th to give and to receive at a time when thought was fluid and ee, and when men of reason and faith refused to repose in a ven of static system and rigid institution—even though most them still longed for a final refuge in a Book, whether the *uran*, the Old Testament, or the whole Bible.

The Guide of the Perplexed, completed in 1190, is a ilosophic and religious treatise. It was written for all men pable of thought and not simply for the specialists. It was signed, as Maimonides said, for thoughtful Jews 'whose studies ve brought them into collision with religion.' Translated from e Arabic into Hebrew and Latin it soon became one of the fluential books of the Middle Ages: but, as is customary with ch books, it has been hidden behind, and by, its users and users.

While it contained no decisively original contribution to ilosophic theology in general, it was a main factor in leading ws to study Aristotle, and so, as Ueberweg said, 'to transmit Christian Europe the science of the Arabs, and thereby to ercise a considerable influence on the Scholastic philosophy.' r that reason Maimonides has often been claimed by modern man Catholic apologists to be 'a Jewish Scholastic.'

It is essential to remember that Maimonides was much freer m 'Biblicism' than the Scholastics in general and Aquinas in rticular. Being himself to traditional Jews a dangerously terodox thinker, he had much more in common with the liberal hristian Abelard, who died seven years after Maimonides was rn, than with Aquinas, the great thirteenth-century systema- er: even though Aquinas was deeply influenced by, and lebted to Maimonides. It has often been noted by the observant at:

> 'the stag does not fear the hound, the dove does not dread the falcon, more intensely and instinctively, than the dogmatist fears and dreads the free philosophical inquirer.'

us while Aquinas nailed down his multitudinous propositions— ny of them among the curiosities of even theological speculation

—with proof-texts from any and every part of the Bible in completely unhistorical manner, Maimonides, while necessarily limited by the historical science of the time, sought to penetrate into the meanings and motivations of the writers of the Old Testament and sought to estimate the value of their testimonies.

This is evident in his outlook upon the 'miracles' of the Hebrew Bible. Like every modern scholar, even in the most traditionalist camps, he 'explained' many, and 'explained away' many more. He was not at ease on Miracle, but did not hide what he thought. Justifying the 'revolutionary step,' as he knew it to be, in writing freely and truthfully in religious circles about real questions, he declared:

> 'Altogether it is my nature that when I cannot help expressing my true conviction except in such a way that it pleases one man of worth and displeases ten thousand fools, I would rather speak to that one man and pay no attention to the murmurs of all that multitude. I claim the right to save that man of worth from his embarrassment and to lead him out of his perplexities so that he attains perfection and peace of mind.'

Yet in dealing with the religious perplexities of his readers there is one perplexity on which Maimonides is silent: the problem of Jesus, the greatest Son of Israel. It is not to be wondered at that the polemics of a thousand years had made it impossible for him to *see* Jesus as He was. He had not the sublime detachment of Spinoza. Jewish scholars like Montefiore and Klausner were not then possible. Talmudic propaganda, plus the counter-propaganda of Church legends, with the still more confusing bank of speculations of the dogmatists in both camps, all served to engender that fog which is only now being slowly dissipated. The basic trouble, then as now, was that the official theologians were trying to *use* scientific thinkers to buttress outmoded dogmas. That is why they only liked 'Reason' as long as it was kept away from inviolate preconception. Hence for these traditionalists the beginning, middle and end of traditionalist theological systems is that there are two kinds of religion and theology—'natural' and 'revealed': that there are two kinds of event throughout the universe—by 'law' and by 'miracle.' If anyone or any book, say *that*, all is well. If anyone questions that, let him be anathema.

LIBERALISM IN ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY

By Canon H. K. Luce, B.D., Headmaster of Durham School

PEAKING at Oxford a few weeks ago, F. R. Barry, Bishop of Southwell, said that the Church's most urgent task to-day 'to recapture for Christian truth the mind of the thinking inority in this country.' That is a task which I am quite sure e Church has no chance of accomplishing without the liberalism nich, in spite of noisy announcements of its death, is still very uch alive, and has before it, I believe, a more favourable uation and greater opportunities than ever before.

The mood of scientists, during their period of explanatory umph in the second half of the nineteenth century, may be emplified by two quotations. The first is from the presidential ldress to the British Association in 1874:

> 'I look forward to the day when science will be able to envisage and explain all that has happened and all that will happen in terms of the ultimately purely natural and inevitable march of evolution, from the atoms of the primaeval nebula to the proceedings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.'

he second is from a lecture by T. H. Huxley:

> 'I do not hesitate to assert that the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are expressions of the molecular changes in the matter of life.'

ne mood of faithful Christians at the same time may be mbolized by this alleged prayer, 'O Lord, grant that this olution be not true, but if it is, grant that it may be hushed up far as possible!' There were some Christians of very different libre, such as Kingsley, who could write:

> 'They find that now they have got rid of an interfering God—a master-magician as I call it—they have to choose between the absolute empire of accident and a living, immanent, ever-working God.'

at in the closing years of the nineteenth century the relation tween science and religion was one of armed neutrality, if not open hostility. As Professor Raven has recently reminded us the first volume of his Gifford lectures—to which this paper is uch indebted—'science' then meant mathematics, physics and emistry; and the scientists were confident that they would soon ow all the answers to all the questions that could be asked about e universe. For the most part, the progess of religion at this ne was from one last ditch to another—until a kind of uneasy ice was reached by which religion accepted a greatly reduced

domain of spiritual values and took care not to ask awkward questions about anything outside it.

It was amid this situation that the Liberal movement in the Church of England arose. It soon became known as Modernism—the term was originally applied by its opponents with a slightly sinister connotation. Father Ronald Knox, for example, wrote this 'Modernist's Prayer':

> 'O God, forasmuch as without Thee,
> We are not able to doubt Thee,
> Help us all by Thy grace
> To teach the whole race
> We know nothing whatever about Thee.'

About the same time a well-known Church of England clergyman, on a lecture tour, received a letter from someone who said 'I hear you are a Modernist.' He wrote back 'What is a Modernist?' The answer came, 'I cannot find out exactly, but I'm told it's worse than anything!' Even in 1953 the term still seems to have a somewhat sinister flavour. The English Modernists were to some extent the descendants of the Broad Churchmen of the nineteenth century. They were not descended from the Roman Catholic Modernists among whom George Tyrrell's is the most prominent English name—though the English Modernists were a good deal influenced by the thought of such Roman Catholic Modernists as Loisy, and Tyrrell himself.

The leading liberal scholars at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth were Hort and Sanday, James Ward, Dean Rashdall, J. Arthur Thompson, J. Y. Simpson, J. F. Bethune-Baker, F. C. Burkitt among others. In more recent times W. R. Inge, B. H. Streeter, W. R. Matthews, C. E. Raven, R. H. Charles, E. W. Barnes and H. D. A. Major have been among those most prominent in the movement. In his recent book *Christianity Past and Present* Basil Willey, Professor of English Literature at Cambridge, and a laymen, writes:

> 'Many hard things are said nowadays about the liberalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the fashionable apologists of to-day clearly feel that they have outgrown it and seen through it. But let there be no mistake here; they have indeed seen through it, that is, it is through it that they have seen the truth.'

This seems to me to be a just tribute to the work of a movement which for its size must surely have numbered a higher proportion of distinguished scholars among its members than any other within the Church.

What was it that these men were trying to do, and how far did they succeed? They took as their watchword a saying by Hort, who, as I have already suggested, may be called the

Father' of English Modernism. In his Hulsean lectures Hort ys, 'There can be no surer sign of decrepitude and decay in ith than a prevalent nervousness about naming and commending ason.' (How apt, as I shall suggest later, those words seem as comment on recent trends in English Christianity!) They sisted, that is to say, on maintaining a reasonable faith. They allenged the claim of scientific materialism to know and explain erything; they challenged, too, the complacency or timidity of ligious tradition in refusing to welcome new truth and acknowdge old error. Their position was difficult in more ways than e. In face of the materialist and determinist outlook of science this time they could not satisfactorily solve the problem of the lation between science and religion: for many of the answers ich science then gave to their questions could not be reconciled th a Christian outlook. On the other side, their resolve to be nest at all costs exposed them to attack from fellow-Christians; ere was more than one actual prosecution for heresy, and cusations of disloyalty and 'watering down the faith' were eryday occurrences. Their greatest service to the Church was eir insistence that the problem of the relation between science d religion must be faced, and their faith that it could be solved. ke Socrates, they acted as a gadfly to prevent the body ecclesias- from going complacently to sleep.

I went up to Cambridge in 1918; and Cambridge just after e first war was a somewhat remarkable place, packed with men a wider range of age and experience than usual. Christianity ere was vigorous, and very much on the offensive; and (this is e point I want to emphasize) ninety per cent. of it was Liberal outlook, whatever its ecclesiastical colour. (The exceptional per cent. was the fundamentalists, represented by what we lled the CICCU—the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian nion). I had myself been brought up as an Evangelical, but the apel tradition of my own College, King's, was towards Anglo-tholicism, under Milner-White, now Dean of York. He and hn How, then Dean of Trinity and afterwards Bishop of asgow, were the leaders of this type of thought among the dergraduates. On the Evangelical side the leaders were W. Hunkin, then Dean of Caius and afterwards Bishop of uro, Charles Raven, then Dean of Emmanuel and later gius Professor of Divinity, and Edward Woods, then Vicar Holy Trinity, Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield. was myself ordained to a curacy at his church.) A very vivid mory in my mind is that of a Mission to the University in 1920, l jointly by Bishop Gore and Bishop Theodore Woods, then

of Peterborough, in which Catholics and Evangelicals worked whole-heartedly together. I went on to Westcott House, the theological college, which was then under B. K. Cunningham often described as the best loved man in the Church of England His deliberate policy was to combine in the college men of all schools of thought in the Church—a most fruitful policy which I have often devoutly wished that other theological colleges would imitate. My chief friend there was an extreme Anglo-Catholic now with the U.M.C.A. in Northern Rhodesia. At this period more men were being ordained in the Church of England than at any other time in this century; and I think it is true to say that on the whole their quality was good, not only in education and intellectual ability, but also in personality.

All the leaders I have mentioned had been Army Chaplains in the war; and whatever their ecclesiastical colour, their war experience had given them a common conviction of the need to find new ways, both in theology and worship, of presenting Christianity to the post-war world. The old ways had not stood the test of war. So we were all liberals together—in a wide sense at any rate; we were eager for new truth and urgently anxious to keep our Christian belief and practice abreast of the times. We were all humanists, too—to us theology meant the study of 'God and everything else,' as it has been somewhat quaintly put. I think that was the secret of two factors in the experience of those years which have always remained with me. One was the strong sense of unity, of which I have already spoken: it was in 1920 that the Lambeth Conference issued its strikingly liberal appeal for Christian unity which subsequent Conferences have felt themselves constrained either to ignore or to explain away. The other was a sense of confidence and optimism. Christianity, we felt was a going concern—it had nothing to fear from new knowledge or from the loosening of old-established traditions and standards which the war had caused. The Churches were advancing and the future was bright. It will no doubt be said that there was a lot of unreal idealism about at this time—and so there was. But this confident faith of which I am speaking went deeper; it had been purified in the furnace of war and cannot be lightly dismissed as escapism or wishful thinking.

I hope this is a reasonably fair picture of English liberal Christianity in the 1920's. Ten or fifteen years later, not long before the outbreak of the second war, reaction set in and a flight from Reason began. The suffering and perplexity of continental countries after the first war led to revivals of older and sterner Christian theologies, of which the new Calvinism of Dr. Karl

arth was the most striking, with his insistence on the infinite anscendence of God in contrast to the total corruption of man, id the futility of all human effort, and his return to a Bible- ntred faith, coupled with a radical criticism which denies that ıy knowledge of the historical Jesus is possible, and presents e Gospels simply as '*Kerygma*'—faith-producing propaganda ssued by an already organised and authoritative Church. This me to England via America and found a congenial environ- ent in the pessimism of the late 1930's and the tragedy of the cond war itself. It was natural enough in such times that nglish Christians should welcome a return to older ways, and se faith in the adventurous and confident liberalism of which ave spoken earlier. Since then theological horizons have indeed rrowed. The new orthodoxy limits the task of theology to he study of the phenomena presented by the existence of the ristian Church,' to quote Canon Alan Richardson. Little atters except the Bible, and historical and scientific research are rned off religious problems such as miracle or immortality.

This development can be illustrated by what has happened what is sometimes known as the '*Doctrinal Report*.' In 1922 e Archbishops appointed a commission to study and report on e varieties of doctrine held in the Church of England. William emple was its chairman. The report was issued in 1938 and was veritable charter of freedom for the liberal Christian within the hurch of England. But by this time the reaction of which I have st been speaking had begun and the report was quickly cold- ouldered into oblivion.

I have already mentioned Professor Willey's book *Christianity ast and Present*. Let me quote his incisive comment on all this. escribing the flight from Reason as a 'menace,' he goes on to say

> 'God made man a rational creature—or at least *capax rationis*—and if we too eagerly put out the light of the mind, we are left darkling, unable to distinguish genuine revelations from bogus ones, which are abundant. We may not make Reason the measure of God, but we may and must use it in drawing its own frontier-line. It is all very well to say '*Credo quia impossibile*,' and we may reach a point where we must say it, or something like it. But it is reason which warns us not to say it before we reach that point, lest we lose ourselves in a perfect jungle of impossibles.'

It is unfortunate and ironical that this anti-liberal reaction ould have come when it did, for the outlook of science has eatly altered since the early years of the century and a satisfac- y understanding, and even partnership, between science and igion seems far more possible now than it did then. I speak th much diffidence here, for my scientific education was, I fear,

completely neglected: but I think that what has happened may be indicated by some recent words of a popular writer: 'We now know too much about the universe to think that we know anything for certain.' This writer goes on to claim that a sense of mystery has now come back into the study of the universe, and I think a good many scientists would admit that; at least it seems clear that since Einstein the idea of a 'closed universe' which could be objectively measured and would shortly be completely understood, has passed away. As a result science is less materialist and determinist than it used to be, and regards its field of study as much wider than before, embracing the understanding of life and personality, and even perhaps of ethics and religion themselves. The idea that science discredits religion is still, of course, deep-rooted in the popular mind, but it does not find confirmation in facts to-day. It is unwise, I feel, to suggest, as some religious leaders have done, that recent developments in science show the religious view of the universe to be true; but it seems clear that science no longer provides the grounds which it was once thought to provide for holding that the religious view of the universe must be untrue. It is surely one of the Church's most urgent tasks to try to 'get that across' to ordinary people.

That brings me to the concluding section of this paper. What are English Christianity's most urgent needs to-day, and how can they be supplied? It is my contention that without a revival of liberalism the future of the Churches is black indeed. Let me attempt to justify that highly controversial statement.

I am not often accused of being unduly conservative, but I confess that I find it a pretty gloomy business to compare the condition of English Christianity now with what I knew when I was first ordained. It is not a merely statistical gloom (which may be quite misleading), occasioned, for example, by the fact that hardly ten per cent. of the population to-day has any continuing connection with a Church, and that a considerable proportion of that ten per cent. are elderly women; or that the annual wastage of clergy in the Church of England now considerably exceeds the supply of recruits; or that the proportion of bishops who hold a first-class honours degree is smaller than ever before. It is a gloom contributed to by a good many personal experiences, of some of which I hope a brief account will not be without relevance.

The chief of those experiences is one which arises out of my own work. One is constantly thinking, as a parson-schoolmaster, about the reaction of one's boys to the Christian gospel and to the claims of the Churches. Over the past twenty years two disturbing tendencies have become increasingly evident. The first

hat fewer boys have in mind, while still at school, the possibility ordination in the future; and that a somewhat small proportion these are sons of laymen, or boys of good intellectual ability, l of virile and adventurous temperament. Lest it be supposed t this state of affairs at Durham School is due to the malign ects of the liberalism that is rampant there, I ought to say that scarcity and quality of ordination candidates from the Public ools in general has been causing the authorities of the urches considerable concern recently and that they have raised matter with the Headmasters' Conference. The second dency is that fewer and fewer boys who are good Christians in n-time at school seem to have any contact with a church at ne in the holidays. By 'good Christians' at school I do not y mean that they say their prayers and come to Communion; that so far as one can see they are trying to follow Christ in ir everyday living and that they instinctively approach prob- s and situations from the Christian angle. It may be said that is part of the larger problem of the Churches' hold over ents—and so in some degree it is. An increasingly large nber of parents come regularly to our Chapel services—in fact ently we have had great difficulty, on Sunday evenings, to get n all in; from what their sons say, few of them are regular rch or chapel goers at home.

You would find it tedious if I tried to analyse, in the detail chool life, the causes of this situation. One builds up one's nion on such a matter from a large number of contacts with s, in Divinity teaching, Confirmation preparation, everyday versation and so on, and with parents too; and the causes are doubt complex, and connected with general tendencies in our al life. But for the particular section of society with which we —reasonably intelligent and cultured, though with a very e range of occupation and social position — I am sure of this least; they will not be convinced by any presentation of listianity which they feel to be guilty of intellectual hedging— icularly in relation to scientific thought. A recently published k, *One Man's Mind*, by John Rowland, who was formerly on staff of the Rationalist Press, tells the story of his conversion hristianity. He says:

> 'The feeling that science has in some way "disproved" Christianity, that any version of Christianity must be intellectually no longer respectable, is mainly responsible for the change in religious attitudes in our time.'

educated people intellectual conviction is a prerequsite to . Nor will their loyalty be won by any church which does put first things first—I am sure that sort of feeling plays a

large part in making boys think that the parson's job is not man's job. I was present at a Confirmation Service not long ag at which all that the bishop could find to say to the candidates wa that anyone who wants to be a Christian must be baptized an confirmed and go to Communion, that anyone who does this is Christian, and that anyone who does not do it is not a Christia That sort of thing does untold harm among young people wh are quick to resent what they regard as narrowness and lack proportion.

Two other 'test cases' nowadays, I am sure, are reunion an sex. The intelligent Sixth Form boy just cannot stomach th attitude of those who claim that particular views of episcop grace or sacramental efficacy are so important as to justify th refusal of fellowship with other Christians whose beliefs on fund mentals are identical with their own. A few weeks ago, under th headline 'The Church must wait for Reunion,' the Bishop Durham was quoted in the *Church Times* as saying

> 'Until Nonconformity realises the true meaning of episcopacy, an feels a hunger for it, the granting of episcopacy holds dangers.'

That means, presumably, that until the Free Churches acce the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of episcopal grace, practical ste towards unity such as inter-communion and exchange of minist are deprecated. In another recent issue the same paper announce that it would no longer print the names of preachers at St. Paul because 'persons not having episcopal consecration or ordinatio had been allowed to preach there. These were distinguished Fre Church ministers who had been invited to take part in a cour of sermons on Christian unity. Can one imagine Jesus saying a would-be disciple, 'Before we admit you to our fellowship, l me hear whether you profess the orthodox doctrine of the operatic of God's grace?' I find too that boys' enthusiasm is readi kindled towards the South India Church—I am sure that muc harm has been done by the Lambeth Conference's niggard attitude towards that magnificently Christian adventure. Agai the intelligent Sixth Form boy has the feeling, I think, that th Churches 'disapprove of' sex. Sex education at schools h advanced enormously in recent years and one is constantly than ful for the clean and Christian attitude of one's senior bo towards sex problems. I think the chief stumbling blocks he are disapproval of birth control—which is something that h come to stay in almost every educated family, many of the Christian in spirit, and anxious to do what is best for the children—and the question of the remarriage of the innocent par in divorce. On both unity and sex, once more, the issues involve

m to be a sense of proportion and the readiness to welcome
v knowledge as coming from God.

'Can these bones live?' Only, I am convinced, through a
ival of liberalism more fearless and far-reaching than anything
re has been in the past. I cannot resist quoting a fine if
torical passage from Carlyle: 'First must the dead letter of
igion own itself dead, and drop piecemeal into dust, if the
ng spirit of religion, freed from this its charnel-house, is to
se on us newborn of Heaven, and with new healing under its
igs.' To show that the devil can at least quote Scripture for
purpose, let me end with some words of Bishop Lightfoot of
rham: 'There is nothing so dangerous,' he said, 'as the desire
make everything right and tight. I find that my faith suffers
hing by leaving a thousand questions open, so long as I am
vinced on two or three main lines.' The times in which we live
d a dynamic conception of Christianity in exchange for the
tic one of the traditionalists. 'Religions commit suicide,' says
itehead, 'when they find inspiration in their dogmas'; and
in, 'A system of dogmas may be the ark within which a
urch floats safely down the flood-tide of history. But that
urch will perish unless it opens its window and lets out the
e to search for an olive branch.' Not everything right and
t, unalterable dogmas, fixed institutions, irruptionist Divine
thods—but loyalty to every fragment of new truth wherever
s seen, adaptable institutions and a view of God's activity
ch does not conflict with science and history. And if you ask
to put chapter and verse to Bishop Lightfoot's 'two or three
in lines,' I can only say what I say to boys who ask the
stion, 'Sir, what *must* a Christian believe?' 'If you believe
God; and if you believe in Jesus as showing us what God is
and setting us the highest standard for everyday living; and
you believe that death is not the end—then you have all the
ristian faith that really matters.' With the simple piety which
friends know to be so characteristic of him, Bishop Barnes
e said, 'The Christian religion can be summed up in a sen-
ce: I have found God, and I will try to follow Christ.' I am
le that it is only with a message of that kind that the Churches
hope to recapture the people of this country. If any one says
, but that's much too simple' I can but reply, with respect,
: just the same thing was no doubt often said in Jesus' time.
ove God, love your neighbour—all the law and the prophets'—
, much too simple—two commandments won't do instead of
—and what about the tradition of the elders?' Yes, very
ple, but Christian, I think, and simple enough, perhaps to work.

BOOK REVIEWS

FOUR COUNTRY PARSONS

Prebendary T. F. Royds, whom many readers of the *Modern Churchman* will remember as Chaplain for twelve years to the Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen, has written a most readable book which defies classification. *Haughton Rectory or Four Country Parsons*[1] is a history of the parish of Haughton in Staffordshire, an autobiography, a book of reminiscences, and a book of ancestor worship. The book has been written first and foremost for the author's numerous relatives and friends who will no doubt find the personal family detail of absorbing interest. Other readers, however, will find much to reward them in the old world charm of a midland country parish, in the story of the Church and its Rectors, and, not least, in the author's own quiet and scholarly wisdom.

The Roydses were Rectors of Haughton for 125 years. The author, grandson of a wealthy 'squarson', succeeded his father in the 'family living' in 1921 and remained Rector of Haughton until 1947. He refers to his Preparatory School Headmaster as 'a scholar and a gentleman and a good sportsman as a gentleman should be.' The description fits Prebendary Royds himself for he combines in a rare degree the instincts of a scholar and a sportsman. He is as much at home in the saddle or with a gun as with the Classics. The mixture is now rare and the reader of this book will readily forgive the author's over-sensitive horror of a false quantity when there is so much about birds, beasts and bees; horses and hounds; dogs and guns; and some good stories of parish life, to embellish the history of the Parish and its Rectors which forms the central part of the book.

An accomplished classical scholar, whose career at Oxford was overshadowed by ill health, Prebendary Royds was able later to proceed to the degree of B.D. He presented two theses. Dr. Ince, the Regius Professor of Divinity, wrote to him:

> 'I have not yet had time to read your dissertations, for your very minute handwriting is a trial for old eyes, but I have read sample portions of both of them, and I can have no difficulty whatever in accepting them as fully adequate for their purpose. They seem to me to be evidence of very careful study and of ability in handling the subject.'

In theological studies he moved in a liberal direction and soon became (as he has since remained) a devoted and reverent-minded modernist. Thus he writes in his preface:

> '"A life devoted to truth is a life of vanities abased and ambitions forsworn." I have been a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union for forty years, and for twelve of them I acted as chaplain at the Annual Conference. This means that I have thrown in my lot with those who try to put truth before orthodoxy, and I have paid the usual penalty. I am not complaining: I am happy in my work, and have never desired high office or felt qualified for it. But it remains a fact that after being favourably received at Chester for ten years, I was kept at arm's length by

[1] *Four Country Parsons*, by Thomas Fletcher Royds. (Published by Wilding & Son Ltd. 33 Castle Street, Shrewsbury; 15/9, post free.)

Lichfield for fifteen years, during which I never saw the inside of the bishop's palace or preached in the cathedral.'

since 1937 the climate changed for him most pleasantly and the late Bishop l the late Dean of Lichfield were his personal friends.

The autobiographical part of the book is, perhaps, the one most likely to eal to the general reader, though some may be more attracted to the story he church and the care which the successive rectors had for the fabric, and ir devotion to the parishioners. Here is a picture of faithful pastoral duty l it is not surprising to learn that the author himself after being unsuccess- as a master at Wellington College found his true métier in the preaching l pastoral ministry.

The book contains some delightful stories. One tells of a French governess o said to the Bishop of London: 'I do like your English Litany—it is so nprehensive—you remember the poor governesses.'

The Bishop: 'How delightful! tell me where.'

Governess: 'You pray for all the women labouring with child.'

Here, by way of a further sample, is a remark by one of the author's sins during the course of a day's shooting: 'There are two things that ght to be kept open to the end of life: one of them is the mind.'

His modernism brought him into difficulties as an assistant curate at Sutton rtenay and at Malvern Priory. Deane (his Vicar at Malvern)

' wrote leaders for *The Church Times* and had to live up to it. My fellow curates were "good Churchmen" and loyally copied everything he said or did as far as they were able. No doubt I ought to have been more of a "sedulous ape," but I never disobeyed orders, and when it came to criticiz- ing me in front of my colleagues, who preserved a docile silence, for preaching a sermon on the lines of Farrers' *Eternal Hope* I stood my ground.'

A war memorial inscription written by Prebendary Royds and since freely d by many other parishes merits citation here:

Sons of this place, let this of you be said,
That you who live are worthy of your dead.
These gave their lives that you who live may reap
A richer harvest ere you fall asleep.

Some of the most moving passages in the book are those that describe his ghter Monica's grave illness in 1934 and the loss of his brave and brilliant Clement, a Flying Officer in the Royal Air Force, in 1945.

All who venerate our English country churches will admire the love and e which the Roydses have devoted to Haughton Church. It was restored 887 by the author's father, who obtained the services of J. L. Pearson the atest architect of the day. In 1937 Prebendary Royds observed the jubilee of restoration. The account of the Jubilee contains two prayers of matchless uty and dignity. The author does not say whether or not he composed n but clerical readers of the book will be glad to use them on suitable asions.

No one can fail to find something of interest in this delightful and many- d book. It is well printed and illustrated. The portraits, especially, are erb.

W. G. Fallows

ENGLISH CASUISTICAL DIVINITY*

Casuistry is an ill-sounding word to most English ears. Mr. F. H. Bradley stigmatized it, with more than usual venom, as 'a false science unlovely in life and unpleasant in decay, odious beyond parallel and in parts most filthy.' But, as Dean Rashdall in *The Theory of Good and Evil* points out, this instinctive dislike is largely because

> 'the bare mention of the casuistical expert is at once apt to suggest the Jesuit Confessor, and all the justifiable antagonisms as well as the traditional prejudices which are apt to be awakened by the mention either of Jesuits or Confessors.'

Mr. Wood admits that to some extent at least Jesuit Casuistry has deserved its evil reputation. But he makes it abundantly clear that the seventeenth-century English casuists, so far from having any leanings in that direction, entertained the strongest antipathy towards it. They included both Anglican and Puritan divines, Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter being among their most distinguished representatives. The need in fact seems to have been both generally felt and admitted for a Reformed casuistry which should take the place of its Roman counterpart.

Despite the differences that held Separatist and High Churchman apart—

> 'all were determined to perform for English Christians in their own day this service of pastoral guidance and moral interpretation to which, as they believed, the Church must be committed at all times in all places. Proud to maintain and defend the protest represented by the English Reformation, they were at once pioneers and traditionalists. They never disdained the experience and wisdom of past masters; yet they dealt severely with any tendencies which they considered subversive of the true welfare of Christian souls' (*English Casuistical Divinity*, pp. x-xi).

Hence it came about that—

> 'Unlike the Jesuits, they were not concerned to provide an ever more efficient confessional technique by which judgment might be passed upon the consciences of men. Their ideal was not to remove from men the exacting duty of probing and resolving their own moral difficulties but rather to train them in self reliance as the responsible and consecrated servants of God in Christ' (p. 65).

Mr. Wood quotes many passages from their writings which illustrate the nobility of their aim. It was not, he says, 'to adjust the precise bounds of virtue and vice . . . not merely to instruct men how to avoid being bad without being very good'; but (in the words of Archbishop Sharp) to show that—

> 'The design of Christianity is to make men as good as they can possibly be . . . It was to be the highest philosophy ever taught to mankind. It was to make us the most excellent and perfect creatures as to purity of mind and heart, that human nature is capable' (p. 66).

Or, as Jeremy Taylor finely puts it, the Christian is to 'Endeavour to do what can never be done: that is to cure all thy infirmities. For this is thy victory, for ever to contend' (p. 127).

Mr. Wood has done a good service in providing us with this introduction to a long neglected aspect of English theology in a book which, he tells us

* *English Casuistical Divinity during the Seventeenth Century*. By Thomas Wood (S.P.C.K. 1952. 12/6.)

also to be an introduction to a larger and more detailed work upon the me subject. Perhaps in this he will provide some answer to the question e gives none in the present volume) as to how the complete oblivion into ich this study of casuistry fell with the coming of the eighteenth century to be accounted for. The fact that that century was so rich in moral ilosophers seems to make it a question of some importance.

D. L. Scott

DR. JOAD COMES HOME

The Recovery of Belief[1] may be called the Spiritual Odyssey of Professor ad. Long ago Ronald Knox wrote his Spiritual Aeneid which ended appro-iately at Rome, though he did not suceed, like the pious Aeneas, in bringing aged father on his shoulders. Professor Joad, however, has returned to his tive Ithaca.

> 'I am grateful, more grateful than I can say, to the Church of England, and more particularly to its country churches, and to the men who, in spite of every discouragement, persist in teaching there the Christian religion as the Church understands it. Without them, I should not, I think, have come to Christianity'.

The vision which the mystic achieves, he says, the sight of the far-off untry to which we are bound is strangely enough 'a longing and regret for hat is somehow familiar'. There is an element of nostalgia in aesthetic ex-rience which finds expression in philosophies of pre-existence from Plato's eory of Reminiscence onwards.

> 'The vision which is so tantalisingly vouschafed to us is of a place to which we have already been and from which we should never have parted. So strong is this feeling, that not only while it persists but even after it has passed, it brings to some the conviction that what they have so briefly glimpsed is in some sense their real home, to which they have come back after a long absence; and, as the vision passes, they are filled with sadness at returning again to the world of their exile'.

ll their deep contemplations', says Wm. Law of the ancient philosophers, ended only to deliver men from the vanity of the world that they might act spirits that came from God and were soon to return to Him'.

Professor Joad confesses that he finds the actual Church disappointing. So most of us, particularly if we happen to be in Holy Orders. 'As we are in e Country Church' is an article republished from *The Layman* in the Decem-r issue of *The Modern Churchman*. The author desires to remain anonymous, d the article is published without comment. It is the old, old story of failure d futility. Professor Joad says:

> 'The Church of England, it is common knowledge, is passing through a difficult time. The number of those who in Great Britain have any continuing connection with it is small, amounting to not more than one tenth of the population, and shows no signs of growing larger. The number of its clergymen is small (it is now about 15,000 in a population of 50,000,000 as compared with 21,000 in a population of 39,000,000 in 1914) and they are for the most part miserably poor. Their lot is not one that any man would envy or that any man who lacked an intense religious conviction would choose. Day in and day out, the parson must swim against the tide of opinion, striving to make headway against apathy and neglect, a

[1] *The Recovery of Belief*, by C. E. M. Joad. (Faber & Faber Limited, 1952.)

persistent seller of goods that the public doesn't want. Many men, especially in country parishes, are made desperate by loneliness'.

There is another article in the same number about two Jesuits: one died excommunicate, the other wrote poetry and was never heard of again till long after he was dead. Their names were Tyrell and Hopkins. If we want a study in disillusionment we should compare the petty parochialism of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* and the squalid court intrigues of *Esther* with the glowing prophecies of Second *Isaiah*. The one thing that makes one a little cheerful about the prospects of our Church is that nearly all the anti-Christian missiles seem to come our way. 'Fight neither with small nor great but only with the King of Israel' was rather a compliment to poor old Ahab.

Professor Joad was emphatically a logican rather than a mystic. In his last testament he sets himself manfully to wrestle with the intellectual difficulties which are standing between the modern man and the Christian Faith. Dialectical materialism is based on the assumption that you must not argue. Indeed it is hard to conceive how a piece of matter could argue. The Kremlin does not argue with the disaffected. 'The ancient philosophers such as Socrates, Alcibiades and others', said, erroneously, Miss Western to her niece, 'did not use to argue with their scholars'. As soon as we assume the existence of freewill, and the adjective free seems superfluous, we enter on the sphere of the supernatural, the spiritual. The way back to the Father of our spirits may be a long and hard one, but it does exist. *Facilis descensus Averno*, to lose your faith is easy. Long and hard is the way which leads up to light, but there is a way out from chaos and the realms of night.

GAMALIEL MILNER

PROFESSOR TAWNEY'S *EQUALITY* REVISED*

This well-known work, first published in 1931, substantially revised in 1938, has now been revised again and a new chapter added. 1931 was a depressing year, and the nineteen-thirties were not, perhaps, a decade of great achievement. But during that period Professor Tawney's book was widely read, and undoubtedly exercised considerable influence; and the political landslide of 1945 was perhaps in some measure due to it. Since the war, indeed, and in part as the result of the landslide, a fair slice of the desired equality has been achieved. This is made clear by the statistics of incomes supplied in the new chapter. And some of the social anomalies of education have been removed by the Act of 1944 and its implementation. This final chapter is mainly a counting of gains, which indeed, there is no denying, have been conspicuous.

With regard to the Welfare State, the economics of it have been examined by Professor Pigou in his *Economics of Welfare*. The future will show whether the Welfare State will be able to surmount the hurdles which stand in its way, namely starvation of capital investment, failure of external markets, inflation, national bankruptcy and so forth, not to mention 'the tragedy of bureaucratic despotism'. But we must wait and see. As for education, there are lions in the path there too. Some doubt whether the means of selection for the Grammar Schools are wholly satisfactory, and the idea of Comprehensive Schools is open to criticism. Educational ideals borrowed from John Dewey of Chicago are calculated to standardize and level down the school population as fodder for the State machine. 'Equality' of opportunity is what we should aim at, and it is certain that there is a great deal more of that than there was a generation ago. The results cannot yet be seen, but we may hope that there will be larger reserves of ability to draw from in the near future. The Welfare State should not, out of mere stupidity, be allowed to drift on to the rocks.

J.C.H.

**Equality*, by R. H. Tawney. Fourth Revised Edition. (Allen & Unwin, 15/-. 1952.)

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF RELIGION

Aids for students working on the history and comparative study of ligions continue to arrive. Among the latest are C. H. Hamilton's *ddhism: A Religion of Infinite Compassion*[1] and E. Royston Pike's *cyclopaedia of Religion and Religions*[2]. The first of the above two volumes the opening one in a new American series, which aims at providing read- s in the basic literature of the world's principal religions. Seven other lumes are in preparation. To select suitable passages out of the enormous ss of quasi-canonical Buddhist writings is no easy task, for it is said that bably no Buddhist monk has ever read the whole of them. In the main may be said that the selection has been fairly made, and that the best dern translations have been used. If the book is used as a companion to larger works mentioned in the footnotes to the preface and in the liography at the end, it should certainly be serviceable. Dating of cuments of this kind is always difficult, but it might have been an vantage if more indication could have been given at the head of each tion as to the period during which it is believed that the passages under sideration were composed.

Mr. Pike's is a valiant effort to provide a concise one-volume encyclopaedia reference purposes. It is clearly meant to aid students who are of other ths than the Christian — otherwise it would not have been worth while ing up valuable space in defining the meaning of 'Christmas Eve' 'Sign the Cross' and 'Jerusalem.' All will not agree as to the selection of items. r instance, while it is good to have a paragraph dealing with the Ashram, expects also to find beside it another explaining what the Ashramas . The checking of the accuracy of all details would be a laborious task; it is a little disconcerting to find near the beginning (page 4) the state- nt that the Abyssinian Christians observe the Sabbath *instead of* Sunday. rely this should be *as well as* Sunday! Certainly in Jerusalem I found the yssinian Church open on Sunday, and a service in progress during the ernoon, and I was told that had the Bishop been present that day, there uld have been an Early Eucharist. On page 254 'Milanda' should be ilinda.' There is some inconsistency in the description of the Poor Clares, page 112, as 'Contemplatives,' but on page 303 as 'chiefly engaged in education of young girls.' But in the main the paragraphs seem to e reasonably correct information, and their range is enormous, extending it does from Adam and Eve to the Malvern Conference!

A. C. BOUQUET

BIBLE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

To teach the Bible to-day is no easy matter. There are all sorts of sons for this. The range of knowledge which effective Biblical teaching mands is very wide. It is concerned with the universe, the human race, the gin, character and development of two religions, the Jewish and the istian religion. The teaching is no mere narration of facts. It is the use acts to explain and illustrate the nature of the Christian Religion and the ds which it meets. Such teaching is a combination of science, history,

[1] *Buddhism, a Religion of Infinite Compassion*, in the Library of Religion. Edited by ence H. Hamilton, Professor of History of Religions and Philosophy of Religion, Gradu- School of Theology, Oberlin College. (The Liberal Arts Press, New York. 1952. Paper r.)

[2] *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions*. By E. Royston Pike. (1 vol.) (George Allen & in Ltd., London. 1952. 30/- net.)

literature, ethics, religion and it all has to be presented in a simple, sincere convincing, interesting, and practical manner. What an undertaking! Such help is provided in *The Bible*[1], by McEwan Lawson, in the 'Reason Why' series. The author explains the purpose of his book as follows:

> 'This book is not meant for the highbrow but is an attempt to answer simply, honestly and with as little technical jargon as possible the questions which ordinary modern men and women ask about the Bible' (p. 7).

Another book intended for Bible teachers is *The New Testament*[2]. This is the N.T. in basic English. Its printing, binding and *format* are extraordinarily attractive. Whether Mr. Kingsley Williams has succeeded in his effort is a matter to be decided by uneducated readers, or to use Mr. Kingsley Williams' phrase: 'the man in the street.'

How to know your Bible, by A. Victor Murray (President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge) is a most attractive volume[3]. It is intended as a guide and interpreter for educated Bible readers. A really congenial *vade mecum.* It reminds us of George Adams Smith, the father of modern exposition of the prophets of Israel, and in his treatment he never forgot that this prophetic teaching was the treasure and the mystery of the Religion of Israel. It is in the same spirit that the President of Cheshunt College, after treating the Old Testament, passes into the New Testament. His concluding chapter '*Revelation* and the Great Beast' is surely sufficiently up to date to attract modern-minded readers.

> 'The book of "the Revelation of St. John the Divine" is one of the queerest books in the Bible, and by reason of its queerness has attracted the attention of many queer folk. Enormous energy has been wasted in tracking down the meanings of the various numbers, such as the number of the Beast (666) of chapter 13, and in identifying him with Mohammed, the Pope, Luther, Napoleon, Karl Marx, the Kaiser, Hitler or Mussolini! It is all very exciting and has been a playground for cranks of every kind. Add to that the fact that we do not know who "St. John the Divine" was; that the original is in the Greek language but follows a grammar all of its own, that the key of much of the symbolism is now lost, and it would appear that it is anybody's guess what it all means. Yet the idea is simple enough, and it has nothing whatever to do with Stalin or any other modern person. The "great beast" is the Roman Emperor and this book was written in the midst of relentless persecution.'

We conclude our restricted survey with Bible books for little children. The title of the whole series is *The Story of Jesus*[4], and the four sub-divisions are as follows: (1) His early life, (2) His miracles, (3) Stories Jesus told, (4) His Passion. These very attractive little booklets are delightfully illustrated by Calvet-Rogniat and might usefully be substituted for Comic Cuts in many Christian homes.

H.D.A.M.

[1] *The Bible.* 'Reason Why' Series. By McEwan Lawson, M.A., B.D. (Herbert Jenkins Limited. 1952. 7/6.)

[2] *The New Testament. A New Translation in Plain English.* By Charles Kingsley Williams. (S.P.C.K. and Longmans, Green and Co. 1952. 8/6.)

[3] Allen and Unwin. 1952. 12/6.

[4] *The Story of Jesus.* By A. Boyer, in four parts. (Longmans, Green and Co. 1952. Price 2/- net each part.)

ST. AUGUSTINE'S CITY OF GOD*

'There has never been any doubt as to the greatness of St. Augustine.' h these words Dr. Burleigh opens his book *The City of God*, which is based n the Croall lectures which he delivered to the University of Edinburgh in 4. What there has been doubt about is wherein the greatness of Augustine Was he philosopher, theologian, or political theorist? At least he has ined the remarkable distinction of being regarded as orthodox by zealous holics and Protestants alike. In his book Dr. Burleigh draws our attention hat is probably St. Augustine's major, and certainly his most distinctive, k — *De Civitate Dei*.

The book is well planned and the obvious result of patient and detailed ly, together with a sure grasp of all the relevant historical, theological, and al background. The excellence of Dr. Burleigh's work is marred by the fact the lucidity of his thought is not paralleled by an equal clarity of expres-. Sentences are too involved, and while the underlying theme is quite nite and the argument always logical, there is frequently an unnecessary osity where a simple sentence would suffice. In short, this is the work of eological professor, it is an academic treatise, but within its circumscribed ts it is wholly a success.

The first chapter is entitled 'The End of an Era.' Our author points out Augustine was quite unconscious of the fact that he stood at the parting he ways. He was so schooled in ancient learning and in the methods of sical culture, that he would have been surprised had he been told that his the age of the great divide. It was just because Augustine understood both ancient culture and the pagan revival so well that he was able to withstand renewed assaults and to proclaim the merits of a Christian philosophy in is which his generation would accept.

To the pagan charge that Christ could not prevent the sack of Rome, ustine replied that the pagan gods had been incapable of defending either e or Troy. Christian churches, however, had been spared by Alaric. This something new, and showed the power of the name of Christ.

Augustine has more than a suspicion of a regard for Rome and its history. Burleigh writes:

> 'Nevertheless St. Augustine cannot find it in his heart to dismiss the virtues of the heroes of ancient Rome as more splendid vices. With all its defects glory is at least a nobler ideal than some of those which men have pursued — sensual pleasure, for example, or greed of private gain. Love of glory may serve to restrain these more sordid vices, and so to beget a certain goodness of character which God can reward. Empire may be a reward for merit of some sort and it was the fitting reward for the peculiar merits of the Romans. They neither sought nor were worthy of the Eternal City, but by their self-forgetting patriotism "deserved" to see their Earthly City exalted over the nations of the world. Can it be by some strange oversight that St. Augustine speaks of God as "assisting" the Roman character, using the word he is accustomed to use of Divine grace which assists the Christian to do good? Or does he adumbrate the later Calvinist doctrine of common grace?' (p. 35).

tle later we read:

> 'It is not altogether fanciful to see in the *De Civitate Dei* a counter manifesto to the *Aeneid* with its powerful and deceptive influence on the literary world of the day. That the author was conscious of this appears

The City of God, by John H. S. Burleigh, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical ry in the University of Edinburgh (Nisbet, 12/6. 1949.)

from the words of the Preface. His subject is to be the City of Go founded for the humble by the grace of Him who " resisteth the proud " (p. 45).

Over against this, however, is set the glory of a greater realm.

> ' The old religion of Rome was inadequate intellectually to resist th scepticism of Greek culture, and ethically to meet the temptations rapidly acquired wealth and power ' (p. 39).

Vergil had taught men to believe in the perpetual glory of the city of Rom Augustine discovered and transmitted faith in the ' supernal city whose victor is truth ' and the contrast between the two is well drawn by the author.

The second chapter is called ' In search of a Christian Philosophy.' D Burleigh traces the successive stages in the development of Augustine thought. To Cicero, Augustine owed ' no less than his philosophical foundation (p. 51). At first, however, his philosophical training and rhetorical standard prevented Augustine from an appreciation of the Bible. ' Long after, when h had accepted it as authoritative, Scripture never ceased to be a mysterio book to him ' (p. 52).

His next taskmaster was Manicheeism, which first presented Augustine wit an awareness of the problem of evil. Finally he came under the influence Ambrose of Milan who

> ' enabled him to see that faith upon authority is reasonable and inevitabl plays a great part in all human life . . . Behind Ambrose, however, the looms the Catholic church . . . It is evident that St. Augustine wa fascinated by the Catholic Church, spread far and wide through the eart and reaching through the centuries ' (p. 62).

Augustine's intellectual development did not cease when he became Christian. Plato as interpreted by Plotinus next cast a spell over his min His Biblical theology was in no small measure affected by his Platonic outlook Yet the influence of Plato was subsidiary rather than paramount. Dr. Burleig writes:

> ' There is throughout the *De Civitate Dei* a clear tension between th Platonism and the Biblicism of St. Augustine. In unfolding the Biblic scheme of Creation, Fall and Redemption he must needs traverse the we defined philosophical provinces of Physics, Logic and Ethics, encounterin their problems as he goes. The tenets of the philosophers are made t yield what support they can for Christian doctrine, and are rejected whe they conflict with it. Rational argument is used as a rule but in the la resort appeal can be made to the omnipotence of God Who is not boun by Platonic physical theories; and also to the triumph of the Christia faith. The whole world, learned and unlearned alike, has come to believ leaving the philosophers in lonely proud but not splendid isolation ' (p. 84

In his third chapter entitled ' The simplicity and profundity of Scripture Dr. Burleigh outlines Augustine's approach to and use of Scripture. He show how Augustine began his study of the Bible in a devotional spirit, how later h became fascinated by the Pauline epistles, and how the problems of grace an election and of free will began to agitate his mind. Always eager to go bac to first principles Augustine wished to find an adequate intellectual argumen in defence of the truth of Scrpiture. Dr. Burleigh writes thus :

> ' No doubt he too, like Calvin and the Westminster divines, wa " moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to a high an

reverend esteem of the Holy Scriptures." He knew also the subjective impression it makes, not indeed by the majesty of its style which to his rhetorical taste was plainly wanting, but by its religious depth and power. "The consent of all the parts" especially the fulfilment of prophecy, is also a cogent argument. But beyond all such considerations his idealist epistemology is the real basis of his Biblicism. All knowledge is revelation. The authority of the Scripture writers is the same in origin and in kind as that of the best philosophers, though greater in degree. Their minds are illumined by the word of God, the Truth Itself, in a word by Christ Who is the source of all knowledge, and the ultimate author of Scripture. The Bible is the Word of God; but not in the sense of literal identity. Words whether written or spoken belong to the outward world of the senses. They are therefore only signs of a reality beyond themselves which they suggest rather than explicitly declare. The truth which lies behind the words of the Bible is brought to light by Christ Himself, the Truth, in so far as He is the "Inward Master" of men's minds. This is the Augustinian equivalent for the Platonic Memory, and also the Calvinist Internal Testimony of the Holy Spirit' (p. 107).

Chapter Four deals with Augustine's conception of 'The divine Plan of Salvation.' The traditional doctrines of the Christian Faith are dealt with, the idea of creation, Augustine's belief in the goodness of created beings, the doctrine of Man, and faith in the Trinity, these are among the teachings that are considered. We are shown some of Augustine's own difficulties, notably his perplexity at the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Burleigh writes in this connection:

'Nevertheless, it is true that for St. Augustine, as for the patristic theologians generally, the doctrine of the Spirit was perplexing and theoretically unnecessary' (p. 114).

A strong churchman though he was Augustine recognised the limitations as well as the significance of the Church. This is well brought out in the Fifth Chapter entitled 'The Heavenly and the Earthly Cities.' Dr. Burleigh puts it in his way:

'The relation of the Church and the City of God is not, in spite of some ambiguity of language, and perhaps also of feeling, one of simple identity . . . it will appear likely that the City of God is none other than the Invisible Church of Wycliffe and Hus, Luther and Calvin . . . By the end of the fourth century the Church as a whole could no longer plausibly be regarded as a colony of heaven . . . The true and abiding worth of the Church only appears when it is seen as subordinate to the Word and gracious purpose of God Himself' (p. 183).

In his last chapter Dr. Burleigh discusses Augustine's Philosophy of History. Though no historian by modern standards, Augustine saw in the final unfolding of events an order and a purpose. Dr. Burleigh comments:

'St. Augustine approaches history with presuppositions which it is the fashion to dismiss as "mere theology." What he is really doing is to select an element in the life story of mankind which he believes to be quite central to it all, and to contain the clue to its meaning' (p. 210).

Why this has as much right to be termed philosophy of History as the Hegel or the Marxist interpretations? Dr. Burleigh continues:

'History as such has an end rather than a goal. It is a process rather than a progress. Its purely human structures rise and pass away. The

earthly city will cease to be a city, and the goods it sought and of whic it was inordinately proud fall into corruption and decay. Yet history not a vain whirl. In it there is accomplished something that will never b destroyed . . . By Christian faith alone is the relation of the temporal t the eternal rightly understood, so that the temporal receives the respe that is its due but no more, and its vicissitudes neither exalt nor disma beyond measure' (p. 214).

In his epilogue Dr. Burleigh intrigues us with speculations upon a possib modern equivalent for *De Civitate Dei*. Charlemagne believed, so it is sai that he had inaugurated the *Civitas Dei* upon earth. Present day attempts t emulate Augustine in writing are likely to be as far removed from reality a was the naïve but fond belief of the Frankish Emperor.

Dr. Burleigh's Croall Lectures are a real help to an understanding and a appreciation of Augustine's thought. Perhaps there is less attention paid tha one might have expected to the political aspects of Augustine's work. Or cannot, however, have everything, and where there is so much to admire, w must be grateful that the omissions are so few. Dr. Burleigh's book judicious, instructive, and stimulating. It will repay careful study and worth reading more than once.

GEOFFREY PARRISH

A SWEDISH BISHOP ON THE GOSPEL

When a minister assumes the office of bishop in the Church of Swede he sends a pastoral letter to his diocese. *The Gospel of God*[1] is an Engli translation of Bishop Nygren's pastoral letter to the diocese of Lund. I author is a distinguished and revered Bishop in the Church of Sweden who ha been prominent in the ecumenical movement. As the head of the Luthera World Federation he has travelled widely in several continents. His pasto letter, however, is not concerned with the great political and social proble of mankind; it does not reflect the tumult and turmoil of the twentieth centur but the inner spiritual security of a man of God. It is a devout meditation o the meaning of the eternal gospel.

Though addressed to ministers of the Church of Sweden, its message w be stimulating to all ministers of the Christian Church. We are taken to th heart of our calling, to our central task of proclaiming the gospel. Th gospel is the peace of God in Christ Jesus. The words 'He is our peace' gath up into a single phrase Christ's work and mission. We are his heralds. Th sacredness of our calling derives not from our persons or our office but fro our message. From this emphasis on the essential evangelical character of th ministry Bishop Nygren discusses the gospel concerning Christ, the gospel preaching, in the sacraments, and in teaching.

English readers will value the book as a commentary on the central tas of the ministry by an orthodox Lutheran. Small in size it is profound in i insights, though the Bishop's emphasis on 'the dominion of death and sin' wi be less familiar and, perhaps, less congenial to Anglicans than to the Luthera to whom the pastoral letter was addressed.

There is a valuable chapter on the sacraments and a weighty defence of th Lutheran doctrine against the Roman.

> 'The difference between Evangelical Christendom and Roma Catholicism is not that catholicism has its centre in the sacrament, an

[1] *The Gospel of God*, by Anders Nygren (S.C.M., 6/-. 1951).

that the Evangelical Church has not. On the contrary, the sacrament is central for both. The difference is this: they differ on the meaning of the sacrament, just as they differ on the meaning of the Gospel as a whole . . .

Luther's opposition is directed against the Roman Church with particular force just because the sacrament, the Lord's Supper, is perverted in its worship. The custom is to differentiate between the sacramental and the sacrificial. The sacramental is what God does, the sacrificial that which we do. Luther's principal objection against the Roman service is that it changes the sacrament into an act of ours. It changes God's sacrament into an offering which we make, a sacrifice which we offer. From a gift of God it makes a service which we perform. But this is only another way of saying that the Evangelical Church, in opposition to the Roman Church, lays claim to being the Church of the sacrament, in the true meaning of the sacrament.'

Bishop Nygren's reflections on the Gospel will be welcomed by many ers in this country and those whose reading of the Gospel is, in some rtant respects, a different one will nevertheless recognise in these pages tterance of a devout and spiritual mind.

W. G. Fallows

PAPALISM AND PROLETARIANISM IN FRANCE

rance is a Roman Catholic country but very few educated English Churchwould venture to assess to-day the strength of Roman Catholic influence ng our Gallic neighbours. We see at times in our English Church press ences to French liturgical reforms and priest-workmen movements. But ssess what real influence these movements are exercising on French on and morals is quite beyond our power. When Hitler asserted that ce was being ruined by alcohol, syphilis and journalism many Englishmen, ially after the French collapse before the Germans, were ready to agree him.

ave French Catholic Reforms succeeded in turning the tide? Mr. David mough's monograph *A Church Renascent*—a study in modern French olicism[1]—provides ground for hope. The author is an Anglican ordinand has spent some time in the study of French Catholicism on the spot, and full of optimism as to the growing influence of French Catholicism, ded that its strategy is based on the realization of the 'relation of the ch to God's proletariat' (p. 37). He is convinced that this is 'The kers' Age' and that the Church needs the workers and that the workers the Church. But the question arises as to what kind of Church?

valuable Preface to this volume is contributed by Canon Eric Abbot, of King's College, London. He writes:

'All Christians are taught by their faith in the Holy Spirit to believe n the Church of God as an adaptable organism . . . That the Church of God should be an adaptable organism to the society of our own day, to his "post-Christian", semi-pagan or wholly pagan, materialistic, industrial or rural mankind, to these proletarians, or *bourgeoisie*, or intellectuals, whatever may be the particular part of human society to which the apostolage of this endlessly adaptable organism is called—this is the prayer of all Christians who are awake to the spiritual need of a society waiting to be reconquered by Christ' (p. xi).

Church Renascent. A Study in Modern French Catholicism by David Watmough. K., 8/6. 1951.)

This ideal of the Christian Church as 'an endlessly adaptable organism' raises the difficult issue of what constitutes loyalty to such a church. The answer to this is admirably given by David Watmough in a quotation from Lockhart's *Life of Cosmo Gordon Lang*.

> 'It is not to that Church *as it is* at any particular time or in any particular place that my loyalty is given, but to that Church in its ideal *as it might be*, as I believe it is meant to be, as it is capable of becoming. And after all, it is to the ideal of any institution—the State, marriage, political party—that ultimate loyalty is due and right' (p. 67).

It is only such an ideal in our Pilgrim's Progress which will enable us when we halt at the Cross Roads to take the right turning.

H.D.A.M.

THE PLAIN MAN'S CHRIST

This book, *The Plain Man's Christ*,[1] is composed of thirty-three chapters which might be described as meditations and studies on the person of Christ in our times. There are headings such as 'His toughness', 'His attitude to war', 'His solution of modern problems', 'His inhumanity' in addition to chapters on the temptation, the cross, and the resurrection. The studies are devotional but devoid of conventional piety; they are the product of honest enquiry and never take refuge in intellectual sophistry. In considering Christ's divinity the author points out that while we know what humanity is we do not know what divinity is.

> 'To say, "Yes, I believe", or "No, I cannot believe it", in answer to the question of the divinity of Christ is comparatively valueless. One true answer is one's life' (p. 174).

The author's method is not to present the socialist Christ, the pacifist Christ, the human Christ, or the divine Christ, but to measure socialism, pacifism, and orthodoxy by Christ himself as he finds him in the New Testament. He claims that Christ gives no precise dogmatic answer on any contemporary issue but only guidance to each one in his own concrete situation. All the attempts to give a blue-print of a Christian society or to lay down rules of Christian conduct are shown to be vain by the following sentences,

> 'Perhaps this disconcerting answer has to be that no one can be fully saved while living in a community as yet unsaved. Without all the citizens we cannot be made perfect: there is no such thing as a completely Christian individual functioning in a largely pagan society' (p. 80).

Mr. Langridge notes that the results of New Testament criticism cannot be by-passed as is so often supposed.

> 'Voices are seldom wanting to calm and reassure us in the presence of fresh challenges, by pronouncing the new approach out of date, and a little behind the times, or else that it is only the lonely and discredited opinion of some solitary eccentric and that it is not taken seriously in the inner circle of those who really know. One wonders how people can dismiss quite as lightly as many seem able to do much more radical criticisms than we find, for example, in the work of Barnes and Loisy! . . .' (p. 239).

Within a short compass in a plain and lucid style which seems without difficulty to solve the problem of communication the book presents Christ

[1] *The Plain Man's Christ*, by D. W. Langridge. (Independent Press, 7/6. 1951.)

eternal rock of offence and salvation in the setting of our perplexed times. y clergymen will find it full of suggestions for sermons while both layman cleric alike will find in it many starting-points for reflection and thought he central object of Christian devotion. H. C. SNAPE

CORRESPONDENCE

PROFESSOR BRANDON AND 'MASTER OF JUSTICE'

t seems to me a pity that the title 'Master of Justice', quoted by Professor don in the March issue, should gain currency in this country to translate Dupont-Somer's 'maître de justice' as applied to the figure in the com- tary on Habukkuk (Dead Sea Scrolls). The English translation obscures act that an almost identical title is translated in R.V. (the) Righteous One, appears as a normal title of honour used of Jesus precisely in those early ters of *Acts* to which Professor Brandon calls attention.

n three places—chapter 3, a sermon by Peter; chapter 7, the speech by hen; and chapter 22, Paul quoting Ananias of Damascus—this title is as the normal honorific of the Master.

Moreover in chapter three this title occurs in immediate connection with the ence 'thy holy servant Jesus', a title which seems to be another normal and is found again in the *Didache*. It appears also in the prayer quoted apter 4 of *Acts*.

o a mere layman like myself the collation of the Dead Sea Scrolls (so far ey are at present available to us) with the text of the *Didache* and of the chapters of the *Acts* sets a problem which seems to need for its solution ollowing suppositions: that there existed after the Crucifixion a Brother- in or near Jerusalem, venerating Jesus of Nazareth as the Righteous One, Holy Servant of the Lord and celebrating a sacrificial meal of bread and but without the 'words of institution' which became later universal and h did not therefore *from the beginning* commemorate the 'body and blood e "Lord"'. Following some persecution (death of Stephen?) many of Brotherhood took refuge with a 'daughter house' at Damascus (*vide.* l Sea Scrolls) and only subsequent to this did the insight of some original (Paul of Tarsus?) apply to the Holy and Righteous One the loftier titles oth Lord and Christ'.

upont-Somer's date for the death of the 'Righteous Rabbi' is almost linly far too early: we eagerly await some clarification on this point from or some other scholar. It does however begin to seem likely that a period me years may have elapsed between the crucifixion of the 'holy Servant ' and the first proclamation of 'Jesus, the Christ'. If so, the reason he 'secret' Messiahship so characteristic of *Mark* is immediately ined, and an entirely new light is thrown on the conflict between Paul and Judaisers'. They now would appear to be the 'traditionalist' members e original Brotherhood reluctant to accept a new interpretation of the s and importance of the Righteous One whom, as good Jews, they sted in venerating but refused to worship.

LESLIE H. PERRATON

East Street, Havant.

the French N.T. (published by the British and Foreign Bible Society) itle given to Jesus Christ in *Acts* iii, 14; vii, 52; xxii, 14, is simply iste,' which after all is not the precise equivalent of the 'Master of e' but is an exact rendering of the Greek. Ed. *M.C.*

'A RANSOM FOR MANY' (*Mk.* x, 45).

Sir,

In the review of Dr. Vincent Taylor's great *Commentary on Mark,* D Major questions Dr. Vincent Taylor's willingness to accept this saying as tha of Our Lord. Rather he would attribute, at least its wording, to 'Paulinism in *Mark.* Paul, it has generally been held, thought that the Death of Jesu was in some sense an exchange for the death in sin of those He came to sav and that such a vicarious death was necessary to remove an obstacle on God side to Human Salvation. While emphatically agreeing with Dr. Major tha such a doctrine is quite incompatible with the teaching of Jesus, I still thin that there is no good ground for regarding it as impossible that Our Lor Himself used the phrase 'A Ransom for many.'

And this for one simple reason. That the Old Testament is full of place in which the Divine work of setting His servants free from calamity and fro sin is expressed in the words 'Ransom,' 'Redeem,' 'Redeemer,' 'Redemption And the careful reader will not find amongst the 70 or so passages in whic the words occur the least basis, except in about three instances, for unde standing that anything approaching a literal purchase is meant. Seeing tha Jesus and His disciples were steeped in the Old Testament, it would not merel be natural for them to use these words in a non-literal sense, but it would b quite unnatural for them to use them in their strictly literal meaning.

Anyone who will take the trouble to look up in a Concordance the use o these words in the O.T. is bound to agree with this statement. When used o God's relation to His people 'Ransom,' 'Redeem,' 'Redeemer,' 'Redemp tion' are in an overwhelming proportion of the instances clearly not used o literal purchase, but simply as a synonym for 'deliverance.'

This was pointed out over twenty years ago in my book *The Problem of th Cross* (now out of print). And it was one of my chief grounds for maintainin that it has been one of the greatest blunders in Biblical exegesis to attribute satisfaction or substitutionary doctrine of the Cross even to Paul.

WILLIAM E. WILSON

Brough Fold, Natland, Kendal.

Addendum

In our *In Memoriam* of J. C. Hardwick, published in the March issue, w regret our failure to refer to J.C.H.s Volume, *Meditations on the Parable* published by James Clarke in 1942. The volume was very well received an the whole edition was entirely sold out within a few months.

Corrigendum

The *Development of English Theology in the later Nineteenth Century* Dr. Elliot Binns (pub. Longmans), is 8/6 not 18/6 as incorrectly stated in ou review (Vol. XLIII, No. 1, p. 57).

(Ed. *M.C.*).

CONTENTS

PAGE

HE OXFORD CONFERENCE 137
THE EDITOR

HE PERMANENT VALUES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM . . 143
SIR HENRY SELF, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.B.E., B.D., M.Sc.

BERALISM IN AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH 154
THE RT. REV. W. D. L. GREER, D.D.

IE CONTINUING TASK OF LIBERAL THEOLOGY . . . 166
THE REV. CANON J. S. BEZZANT, B.D., M.A.

BERAL PROTESTANTISM 181
THE VERY REV. W. R. MATTHEWS, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.LITT.

BERAL CATHOLICISM 189
THE REV. D. J. W. BRADLEY, M.A.

GLISH LIBERAL NONCONFORMITY 199
THE REV. E. L. ALLEN, M.A., PH.D.

OGRESSIVE JUDAISM 207
THE REV. J. W. PARKES, M.A., D.PHIL.

NTINENTAL THEOLOGY, PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC . 218
PROFESSOR MARCEL SIMON

EEDOM IN RELIGION: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS . . 228
THE REV. R. S. LEE, M.A., D.PHIL.

E MORAL FOUNDATIONS OF LIBERALISM . . . 237
THE REV. H. C. SNAPE, M.A.

E FUTURE OF RELIGION 244
PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY, O.M., D.LITT., F.B.A.

THE NATION'S REMEMBRANCE

POPPY DAY

British Legion · Haig's Fund · Pall Mall · London · S.W.1

(Registered under the War Charities Act, 1940)